School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1316206

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I)

By

EDWIN A. ABBOTT

Honorary Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge
Fellow of the British Academy

Cambridge University Press
C. F. CLAY, Manager
London: Fetter Lane, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100, Princes Street
1913

Price Two Shillings net

BS
2555
A32

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET
Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

All rights reserved

MISCELLANEA EVANGELICA (I)

BS
2555
A3.2

BY

EDWIN A. ABBOTT
Honorary Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge
Fellow of the British Academy

Cambridge
at the University Press
1913

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

19-19613

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

PREFACE

THE three discussions contained in this treatise will be incorporated later on as Appendices in a volume that will form Section II of *The Fourfold Gospel* (Part X of *Diatessarica*). The first of the three, on "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean"—if its conclusion is correct—throws light on early Galilaean thought as filtering down from the Hebrew Scriptures, and on the reasons that have obscured its expression in Greek. It seemed to me that some who would not be disposed to read *Diatessarica* might be willing to glance at a study of this and one or two other special subjects.

The bracketed "I" in the title "*Miscellanea Evangelica* (*I*)" indicates that along with future parts of *The Fourfold Gospel,* I hope to publish parts of *Miscellanea* to illustrate them. I have had by me for many years classified parallelisms from the Evangelists illustrating their treatment of what may be called "*The Small Circumstances of the Gospels,*" and it has often occurred to me that the publication of these, even without any comment, would be useful to an intelligent student for whom "a word is enough."

These "small circumstances" seem, some of them, very commonplace and uninteresting. What does it

matter, we may be inclined to ask, whether Jesus said or did this or that "*in a house*," as Mark (often alone in this respect) repeatedly tells us; or "*in a boat*," as Mark and Matthew say so often and Luke so seldom; or after "*returning*," as Luke alone tells us, repeatedly using a word that no other Evangelist uses; or that He did this or that "*across the Jordan*," or on "*the sea of Galilee*," both of which expressions Luke consistently avoids; or that Jesus "*looked round*," as Mark almost alone describes; or that He "*finished*" certain "words," "parables" &c., as Matthew, and Matthew alone, tells us in a kind of refrain?

I believe it "matters" a great deal in some of these and other apparently insignificant instances. We learn from many of them often much more than might be expected by those who are accustomed to explain phrases of this kind as though they were the "graphic detail" of a modern newspaper correspondent. What we learn varies. Sometimes we learn merely that the Evangelist dislikes this or that expression (as Luke dislikes 'sea' of Galilee), and this does not take us very far. But at other times we are led back to traces of some tradition obscurely expressed by Mark, and omitted or altered by one or both of the two later Evangelists, Matthew and Luke.

In such cases, as has been shewn to some extent in the volume that forms the Introduction to The Fourfold Gospel, John often intervenes in order to explain or correct what was harsh or obscure in Mark. When this is so, we have, in effect, four first-century witnesses attesting with divergent evidence some

word or deed that has a pre-eminent claim to be regarded as proceeding from Christ; and thus a great discovery may arise out of the close examination of a classified group of little things.

Miscellanea (*I*), although it supplies some facts and classifications that may be useful to the reader in considering the Gospel use of the terms "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean," does not give much aid elsewhere in the shape of classified facts. I hope hereafter to do much more. Previous parts of *Diatessarica* have dealt abundantly, and sometimes superabundantly, with conjectures. Future parts, if published, will contain, I hope, much fewer conjectures, and many more references to classified facts that may remain, useful and used, long after most of the conjectures have passed into oblivion.

By publishing these Appendices to the book, in a cheap form, before the book itself, I hope to obtain some criticisms of my treatment of the difficult questions discussed in them which may enable me to correct anything that is erroneous or obscure before incorporating the discussions in the larger volume.

Besides obligations to other friends which I hope to acknowledge in the Preface of the completed volume, I desire here to specify my particular debt of thanks to Rev. G. Margoliouth, Senior Assistant in the Department of Oriental Printed Books and MSS at the British Museum, for revising the proofs of Chapter III on The Interpretation of early Christian Poetry, as to which I also received some valuable suggestions from my friend and former pupil, the

Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A. The subject is, in some aspects, technical as well as difficult, and without the aid of an expert I should hardly have ventured to publish my views upon it.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

Wellside, Well Walk,
Hampstead, N.W.
9 *Sept.* 1913.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

PAGE

NAZARENE AND NAZORAEAN 1

CHAPTER II

THE DISCIPLE THAT WAS "KNOWN UNTO THE HIGH PRIEST" 18

CHAPTER III

THE INTERPRETATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN POETRY 39

CHAPTER I

NAZARENE AND NAZORAEAN

IN this Chapter it will be argued that (i) "*Nazarene*," meaning a man of Nazareth, and (ii) "*Nazoraean*," meaning the *Nêtzer* or Rod of Jesse mentioned by Isaiah, were probably interchanged by a play on the two words ; so that the populace, acclaiming Jesus as the Lifegiver and Healer, altered "Jesus the Nazarene," into "Jesus the Nazoraean." To state the theory more exactly, we should say that they called Him Jesus the Nêtzer, or the Na(t)zoraean, partly because there was a pre-existing belief that the Messiah would be the Nêtzer, and partly because they vaguely felt what Matthew ventured definitely to express, that His residence from childhood onward in Nazareth had been ordained to fulfil the prophecy "He shall be called *Nazoraean* (i.e. *Nêtzer*)[1]."

If this was the case, it would appear that "Nazarene[2]," a

---

[1] Mt. ii. 23. R.V. renders Ναζωραῖος sometimes "Nazarene" and sometimes "of Nazareth," but never by its exact form "Nazoraean."

[2] See Pliny v. 81 "Coele habet Apameam Marsya amne divisam a *Nazerinorum* tetrarchia," which suggests a field that ought to be explored by anyone entering into the question of the origin of "*Nazarene*." But it seems to have attracted very little notice. I am informed that nothing is known of these "*Nazerini*." Pliny is not referred to by *Encycl. Bib.* 3360 (where it is maintained that "'Nazareth' ought to mean 'Galilee'"), or by Hastings' *Dict.* iii. 496, or by Prof. Burkitt in his *Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names*, on which see footnote at the end of this Chapter. Strabo does not mention "*Nazerini*." Was Pliny misled by misunderstanding some reference (1) to the "cursing of Nazarenes" (see Schürer II. ii. 89) which had already reached his ears, or (2) to some pre-christian Jewish sect like that which Epiphanius calls "Nasaraeans" (see below, p. 9)—which he took, in either case, as referring to some folk in the North of Palestine?

form used by Mark and Luke but not by Matthew and John, was an error, except in special contexts which may prove that the place-name, and not the Messianic title, was meant. It is proposed here to examine the Gospel uses of (i) "Nazarene," and (ii) "Nazoraean."

"Nazarene" occurs four times in Mark: (1) "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, Nazarene?" (where Matthew omits the whole story, and Luke follows Mark[1]); (2) "having heard that it is Jesus the Nazarene[2]"; (3) "thou also wast with the Nazarene, [namely] Jesus[3]"; (4) "Jesus ye seek, the Nazarene, the crucified[4]."

It will be observed from the notes below that only in the first of these four instances is Mark followed by any other Evangelist. That instance occurs in a case of exorcism. The demoniac exclaims "Jesus, Nazarene," and "I know thee who thou art, [thou] the Holy One of God." "Nazarene" might be formed from the noun-form "Nazara[5]" (used once by Matthew and once by Luke for the ordinary "Nazareth") a place not mentioned by Josephus or the Talmud and probably of small importance. It would appear to be a place-name that would suggest to many Jews, on first hearing it, the question "Where is it?" What are we to infer from its use here? Some such title as "Nazoraean," in a Messianic

[1] Mk i. 24 Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (D Ναζαρηναι, *d* Nazorenae), Lk. iv. 34 Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ (D Ναζορηναι, *d* Nazarenae). Mk and Lk. agree *verbatim* in what follows: "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God."

[2] Mk x. 47 W.H. marg. Ἰ. ἐστὶν ὁ Ναζαρηνὸς *i.e.*, perhaps, "Jesus [namely] the Nazarene," Mt. xx. 30 ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, Lk. xviii. 37 ὅτι Ἰ. ὁ Ναζωραῖος (D Ναζαρηνος, but *d* Nazoraeus) παρέρχεται.

[3] Mk xiv. 67 καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (the MSS vary as to order, D and *d* Ναζορηνου), Mt. xxvi. 69 "Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean," Lk. xxii. 56 "This man, too, was with him."

[4] Mk xvi. 6 Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον (D om. τὸν Ναζαρηνόν), Mt. xxviii. 5 Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε, Lk. xxiv. 5 "Why seek ye the living with the *dead*?" For *nêtzer* = νεκρός, s. p. 10.

[5] Mt. iv. 13, Lk. iv. 16. Elsewhere (Mt. twice, Mk once, Lk. 4 times, Jn twice, Acts once) it is Ναζαρέτ, or Ναζαρέθ.

sense, would seem more appropriate. Can it be that, when Jesus rose to sudden fame in Galilee, people began at once to play on the words "Nazarene" and "Nazoraean," and that the demoniac followed the popular cry, which Mark has wrongly rendered? An affirmative answer is suggested by the very few instances in the *Aboth* where a Rabbi is introduced with a birthplace-name or something different from the ordinary "son of so-and-so[1]."

But before passing on to shew how the hypothesis of an original *Nêtzer* might suit the facts, we must recognise that the play on the two words, *Nazara* and *Nêtzer*, might be complicated, when passing into the first Greek Gospel, by a confusion with a third word, *Nazîr*, i.e. "*Nazirite*." This, in A.V., is always spelt with an *a*, incorrectly, "*Nazarite*." The *Onomastica Sacra* shews that Eusebius confused the three terms, *Nazara*, *Nêtzer*, and *Nazîr*[2]. Jerome, as we shall see,

[1] In the *Aboth*, Rabbis are very rarely introduced by any title except *ben* "son of," or *îsh* "man of." But there are at least the following exceptions: (i. 2) "Simeon *the Righteous*," (i. 7—8) "Matthai *the Arbelî*," i.e. from a place called Arbela, (iii. 17) "R. Eliezer *the Modai*," i.e. from a place called Modai(m), (iii. 28) "R. Eleazar *Chasmah*" (Levy ii. 89 *b* "*Chisma*"), (iv. 16) "R. Jochanan *the Sandalar*," i.e. the maker (*or*, wearer) of sandals, (iv. 26) "Samuel *the Little*," (iv. 30) "R. Eliezer *the Kappara*" (Levy iv. 357 *a* "*the Cyprian*").

Some of these epithets or place-names are probably plays on words. *Arbela* (Levy i. 157 *b*) means "sieve"; "sandal" suggests that the Rabbi, besides being a sandal-maker, obeyed the Marcan precept (Mk vi. 9) "be shod with *sandals*" (s. *Corrections* **390** (ii) (ε) *a*); "*the Little*" might mean "the younger," but it is explained in *J. Sota* ix. 13 "because *he made himself little*"; "*the Cyprian*" (Levy iv. 357 *a*) may mean "the gum-seller" (in which I cannot see any allusive force); "*Modai*" (Levy iii. 42—3) is a form of the word "know," and (*Sabb.* 55 *b*) R. Gamaliel said "We always need *Modai* (knowledge), for Eleazar the [man] of *Modai(m)* (knowledge) said..." (Goldschm. "wir brauchen immer noch *den Modäer*," Levy "noch immer bedürfen wir des Ausspruches *des Modaï*"); lastly "*Chisma*" (Levy ii. 89 *b*) is expressly said to have been so called because he had once been a dumb and, as it were, *muzzled* teacher, and became "*unmuzzled*."

[2] (1) Νάζαρ (sic) is explained by Eusebius (see Index to *Onomastica*)

indicates that "*Nazirite*" was an early interpretation of Matthew's "*Nazoraean.*" Tertullian, after quoting from Luke the cry of the demoniac "What have we to do with thee, Jesus[1]? Art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God," and after saying that "a (or, the) prophet" had prophesied of "the Holy One of God[2]," and that "God's name of 'Jesus' was in the son of Nun," proceeds to explain "*Nazarene*" thus: "The Christ of the Creator had to be called *Nazaraeus* according to prophecy; whence the Jews also designate us by that very name (ipso nomine) *Nazaraeans*, after Him. For indeed we are those about whom it is written '*Nazaraeans* are made whiter than snow[3]'." Tertullian is quoting a passage in Lamentations rendered by A.V. "Her *Nazarites* were purer than snow[4]." He takes "*Nazarene*," in Luke, applied to Jesus, as meaning "*Nazirite*," and himself applies the term, in this sense, to the followers of Christ.

Obviously such an application could not long maintain itself against Jewish controversialists. It is true that the

as ἄνθος, (2) Ναζαραῖοι (*v.r.* Ναζωραῖοι and Ναζαρινοί) as the ancient name of Christians, (3) Ναζαρέθ as (*a*) καθαριότης (*b*) ἄνθος ἀκραιφνὲς ἢ καθαρότης (*c*) the name from which Christ was called "Nazoraean," (4) Ναζαρέτ as ἀκρεμόνος (branch) αὐτοῦ ἢ καθαρός, (5) Ναζειραῖος as (*a*) ἅγιος (*b*) ἢ καθαρώτατος (*c*) ἢ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἀφωρισμένος θεοῦ, (6) Ναζηραῖος (*v.r.* Ναζοραῖος) as ἐξηνθισμένος, (7) Ναζωραῖος as (*a*) καθαρός (*b*) ἅγιος ἢ καθαρός (*c*) the name of Christ derived from Ναζαρέθ (adding καὶ Ναζαραῖοι (sic) (*v.r.* Ναζωραῖοι and Ναζαρινοί) τὸ παλαιὸν ἡμεῖς οἱ νῦν Χριστιανοί).

These details shew that whereas (1) the root of *Nêtzer* implies "flowering" or "growing," and (2) *Nazîr* implies "consecration," "purity," "separation (or, dedication) to God," &c., Eusebius oscillates between the two, with an additional occasional oscillation towards (3) "the town of Nazareth."

[1] Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* iv. 7. He omits "Nazarene" in the quotation, but proceeds to explain it in the next chapter, as though he had quoted it.

[2] Clark's translation suggests, as the prophecy, Ps. xvi. 10 "thine holy one," and Dan. ix. 24 R.V. txt "the most holy."

[3] Tertull. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 8.

[4] Lam. iv. 7 R.V. "her *nobles* (marg., 'or, *Nazirites*')."

term "Nazirite" was used with some latitude, as is shewn by the Jewish discussion whether Samuel could be called "a Nazirite[1]"; and the Jewish and Syriac Versions of Ben Sira give Samuel this title[2]. But in the face of Christ's own statement that "the Son of Man came eating and drinking[3]," "Nazirite," applied to Christ, could hardly hold its ground. Nevertheless it is not only credible but even probable that Mark (whose Gospel does not contain the saying about "eating and drinking") is here recording unintelligently a tradition that called Jesus *Nazîr* instead of *Nêtzer* and that took *Nazîr* to mean "holy one." "*Nazirite* (i.e. *Nazir*) *of God*" is twice rendered in the LXX "*holy* [*one*] *of God*[4]." This does not indeed occur in any passage where "*the* Holy One" is used in its highest sense. It refers merely to Sampson. But it might easily combine with other causes to lead the earliest of the Evangelists into an error as to this difficult title. While explaining "thou *Nêtzer*" as "thou *Nazarene*," Mark might naturally add—in accordance with his frequent habit of combining two interpretations[5]—"thou *Nazirite of God*" in the sense of "thou *holy one of God*."

It will be shewn hereafter that the influence of a familiar term like "*Nazirite*" (spelt with a *z*) might go even further than the influence of the name of an insignificant place like *Nazara*, to cause a substitution of *z* for *tz* in early Greek transliterations of *Nêtzer*. But we now pass to the consideration of other passages in the Gospels testing the *Nêtzer* hypothesis, beginning with the denials of Peter. In the first denial, where Mark has "Thou also wast with the Nazarene [namely] Jesus," Matthew has "Thou also wast with Jesus *the Galilaean*[6]."

[1] See the Talmudic *Nazir* ix. 5 (Mishna).

[2] Sir. xlvi. 13*c* "a Nazirite of the Lord in prophecy" (not in LXX), Syr. "a Nazirite in prophecy" (om. "of the Lord").

[3] Mt. xi. 19, Lk. vii. 34.

[4] Judg. xiii. 7 LXX ἅγιον θεοῦ, al. exempl. Ναζιραῖον θεοῦ, rep. xvi. 17.

[5] See *Clue* passim, and especially **128** foll.

[6] Mk xiv. 67, Mt. xxvi. 69.

In the second denial, where Mark has "This [man] is [*one*] *of them*," Matthew has "This [man] was with Jesus *the Nazoraean*[1]." If "Nazoraean," meaning *Nêtzer*, was regularly used about Jesus by His Galilaean followers in Jerusalem, it would naturally be repeated by the Roman soldiers, and afterwards by Gentiles in general, as a mere place-name—"Nazoraean" being regarded by Mark and other Greek writers as an inaccurate form of "Nazarene."

"Nazoraean" occurs in all the Gospels except Mark, and still more frequently in the Acts[2]. But it does not occur in the LXX nor in Greek literature apart from Christian influence. Matthew says (1) that "Nazoraean" was connected with residence in "Nazareth," but also (2) that the residence was ordained in order to fulfil a prophecy about "Nazoraean"—which is not a form of "Nazareth." His words give us the impression of an early play on words by which Christ's disciples converted some form of "Nazareth" or "Nazara" into some word used in prophecy to denote the Messiah: "He [*i.e.* Joseph] came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that 'he shall be called *Nazoraean*[3]'."

Jerome, in his commentary on Matthew, gives two explanations of this. One is, that "Nazaraeus" means "holy," and that all the Scriptures declare that the Lord will be holy. Another is, that there is a reference to Isaiah's mention of "Jesse" and "a *branch* out of his roots[4]." In his commentary on Isaiah he goes further: "That expression [as to] which, in the Gospel of Matthew, *all ecclesiastical writers seek, and cannot find* where it is written 'that he shall be called (?) *Nazoraean*

[1] Mk xiv. 69, Mt. xxvi. 71. Lk. xxii. 58 has "Thou also art [one] of them." R.V. nowhere renders "Nazoraean" literally, see p. 1, n. 1.

[2] Mt. ii. 23, xxvi. 71, Lk. xviii. 37, Jn xviii. 5—7, xix. 19 (Acts 7 times, including xxii. 8 "I am Jesus *the Nazoraean*").

[3] Mt. ii. 23 ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.

[4] Is. xi. 1.

(Lat. text *Nazaraeus*),' *learned men among the Hebrews think to be taken from this passage.*" He goes on to say that the peculiar sound of the Hebrew צ, (*tz*) in *ntzr*, " branch," being between *s* and *z*, cannot be expressed in Latin.

The hypothesis of this allusion gives us a reasonable explanation of the term " Nazoraean," if it was a Messianic name, derived from Isaiah, " And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a *branch* (*nêtzer*) out of his roots shall bear fruit." The Targum paraphrases "*branch*" as Messiah thus : " And there shall go forth a king from the sons of Jesse and a *Messiah* from his sons' sons shall be anointed [as prince]." It ought not to surprise us if, among many Messianic names in the first century, that of the Branch of the Tree of Jesse, the Prince of the House of David, the symbol of the Kingdom of Peace, became familiar and popular, so that the Messiah might be hailed as *Nêtzer*, along with the more prosaic and ordinary title " Son of David."

The name "Jesse" is associated with old age[1]. There was a picturesque paradox in the history of the old man's youngest son, a mere stripling, overlooked at first among his brothers, and coming unexpectedly to the rescue of Israel from the Philistines. No wonder that the story suggested to the poets and prophets of his people the thought of a branch springing out of the root of a tree decaying and almost dead. In later times, when the tree of the house of David had suffered grievously from foreign conquerors, it was natural that Isaiah, after predicting that the Lord would " lop the boughs with terror," should refer to the "branch" from "Jesse" in his comforting prophecy, " And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit, and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him[2]."

[1] 1 S. xvii. 12 (R.V.) "the man was an old man in the days of Saul stricken [in years] among men."

[2] Is. xi. 1—2.

Philo appears to refer to this passage when he says, not long after quoting Isaiah about Israel as being once childless and desolate, but now a mother of many children[1], that "when the trunk is cut down, but the roots not taken away, *new shoots spring up* by which the old decrepit tree is surpassed[2]." It may be the same, he says, in mankind. Wherever a small seed of virtue is left, it may become a source of all that is best and most glorious, through which desolate cities are once more inhabited, and nations advance in population. This is his philosophic and impersonal and abstract way of saying what Galilaeans would express by avowing their faith in the "Branch" from the aged Jesse, who would "assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah," and stand for "an ensign of the peoples, unto whom the nations shall seek[3]."

That "Jesse" was the subject of Jewish mystical thought at an early time appears from Chronicles, where his name is spelt so as to make it identical with "man"—"vir, potens robore," says Rashi[4]. *Sota* goes further. It fastens on the warlike meaning of "man" and ignores "Jesse." Instead of saying that "David son of [a] man [that was an] Ephrathite[5]" might have two meanings, 1st, son of Jesse who was called "man" (*vir*), and 2nd, "son of God," since God is "a man of war[6]," it gives the second meaning alone. Probably there were in the first century very many legends about Jesse of which only a few survive[7].

[1] Philo ii. 434—5 quoting Is. liv. 1.

[2] *Ib.* ii. 437 alluding to Is. xi. 1. [3] Is. xi. 12, 10.

[4] 1 Chr. ii. 13. The passage also spells "David" "plene cum *yod* propter honorem Davidis," and omits "Elihu," so as to make David the seventh son instead of the eighth.

[5] 1 S. xvii. 12. R.V. omits "man."

[6] *Sota* 42 *b* quoting Exod. xv. 3.

[7] See *Berach.* 58 *a* about Jesse as being one who always moved "with *a multitude*," a legend arising from 1 S. xvii. 12 (*lit.*) "went among *men*," Rashi "numerabatur in coetu *virorum honoratorum*," Targ. (Walton) "*juvenibus*," LXX "*men*" but *v.r.* "*years*."

The early evidence from Chronicles bearing on the spelling of Jesse's name gives somewhat more importance than might be otherwise attached to the curious statement of Epiphanius about "Jessaeans," as an early name for Christians. It deserves mention here as it bears on the meaning and spelling of "Nazoraean."

Epiphanius says that all Christians (before they were called Christians at Antioch) were called "Nazoraeans," and indeed, "for a short time, Jessaeans." The Jessaeans he there regards as deriving their name from Jesse[1]. But, later on, he suggests that the Jessaeans may have derived their name either from Jesse, or from Jesus as meaning Healer or Saviour[2]. He identifies them with those whom Philo calls Essaeans (known to us as Essenes) some of whom accepted Jesus as Messiah, from whom—as being conceived in the womb at Nazareth, and hence called "Jesus the Nazoraean," they called themselves *Nazoraeans*[3]. Finally, he says, "But it was a different sect that called themselves *Nasaraeans*; for the sect of the *Nasaraeans* was before Christ and did not know Christ[4]."

While making these startling statements Epiphanius does not quote Isaiah. Nor does he seem to have perceived that such sects might naturally derive their names from the "Nêtzer" of Jesse mentioned by Isaiah. But his testimony is of all the more value. For it shews that he is not inventing facts, or adapting facts to a theory of his own derived from the text of Isaiah. He is merely enumerating and describing (what he believes to have been) Jewish and Christian sects. Among the most ancient of these he finds (1) "*Nazoraeans*," connected with "Jesse," and (2) a still earlier sect "before Christ," called "*Nasaraeans*." If there were such sects, or early traditions

[1] *Haer.* xxix, p. 116 foll. [2] *Ib.* p. 120. [3] *Ib.* pp. 120—1.

[4] *Ib.* p. 121 Ἄλλοι δὲ Ναασαραίους ἑαυτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν. The ἄλλοι appears to be emphatic: "it was others."

mentioning such names, it must occur to every one that the names had some connection with Isaiah's mention of the *Nêtzer* of *Jesse.*

Against these views it may be urged that the Talmud knows nothing of such a Jewish sect, or of such a Messianic name. But the Talmudic silence, under the circumstances, would prove little. The Talmudists would naturally be silent about a Jewish sect, or a Messianic title in Scripture, that had originated a term fraught with such sinister associations to their nation, as "Nazoraean" and the kindred "Nazarene."

There is a trace, however, of allusion to "Nazoraean," if connected with *nêtzer*, in a story about a heretic called Nêtzer, one of five disciples of Jesus, put to death for heresy. He pleaded for his life, on the ground of the favourable mention of "the branch" ("*branch* of Jesse") in Isaiah. But he was answered by another text of Isaiah mentioning "an abominable *branch*," where LXX has "corpse" for "*branch.*" He was told that he was the latter, and must be killed[1].

So far as it goes, the evidence of the Talmud favours the derivation from "branch" rather than from *Nazara.* For it calls Jesus (or His followers) *Nôtzri.* This does not resemble *Nazara.* But it closely resembles a form of "branch" (*Nôtzer*) extant in the text of Ben Sira, "*The branch* of violence shall not be unpunished[2]." And it is easy to believe that the Jews parodied a form of *Nêtzer*, to distinguish the Branch of the

[1] See Levy iii. 431 *b* quoting *Sanhedr.* 43 *a* which plays on Is. xi. 1, xiv. 19. To the Jewish mind, regarding Israel as the Vine of the Lord, the Messiah might seem to be not only a Branch from the roots of Jesse but also a Branch from the roots of the Vine. To Christians the Messiah seemed the Vine itself. Yet the thought of "David" as the Branch seems merged with the thought of David, and David's Son the Messiah, as the Vine, in *Didach.* § 9 "We give thee thanks, our Father, for the *holy vine of David.*" On "corpse" for "branch" see p. 17 n.

[2] Sir. xl. 15, Gesen. 666 *a.* The margin drops the *ô.* It is also dropped in *Ben Nêtzer* (referring to Dan. vii. 8 "a little horn" (*Gen. r.* on Gen. xxxii. 11, Wü. p. 374)).

Christians from that true *Nêtzer* of Jesse which God might call "the *branch* of my planting[1]."

According to this view, "the Nazoraean," in the mouths of the peasants and fishermen of Galilee, meant the Prince of the House of Jesse, or David, who was to "judge the poor with righteousness," and to bring about a reign of universal peace; and hence, whenever we find in a Gospel an appeal to the "Son of David" or a mention of "Son of David," we ought not to be surprised if some parallel Gospel has "Nazoraean." Jesus came, literally, from Nazareth or Nazara. But the people that acclaimed Him would say in their hearts "Not Nazarene, but Nazoraean," and their tongues would repeat only the latter. A literalistic Evangelist like Mark might feel bound to give the place-name literally, but he would not express the popular feeling.

Conveying, as it does, the notion of a "shoot," growing up from the root of Jesse into life and vigour, "Nazoraean," if meaning *nêtzer*, would suggest to all Jews thoughts of strengthening, healing, revivification, and resurrection. Peter's first proclamation of the gospel begins with it: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: *Jesus the Nazoraean*"—going on to describe His resurrection from death as predicted by David His ancestor, and His establishment as "both Lord and

[1] Is. lx. 21. On *ha-Nôtzri* applied to Jesus, see *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (R. T. Herford) p. 52 n. "It is well known that the name of Nazareth does not occur in the Talmud, and indeed first appears in Jewish writings so late as the hymns of Qalir (A.D. 900 *circa*), in the form Nātzerath. This is probably the correct Hebrew form; but there must have been another form, Nōtzerath, or Nōtzerah, to account for the adjective Nōtzri."

Since this form "Nōtzerath," which "must have been" in existence, if we are "to account for the adjective Nōtzri," cannot be found, it is natural to look in some other direction for an origin of *Nôtzri*, as being "the Branch" in a bad sense, like "the abominable branch," or "the branch of violence."

For an illustrative parallel, see Schürer I. ii. 298 on the late Jewish interpretation of Bar-Cosiba, whom Akiba had called "*star*," as "*deceiver*

Messiah[1]." Peter's first act of healing is also introduced with it, "In the name of *Jesus Christ, the Nazoraean*, walk." This is followed by a proclamation of Jesus as "the Prince of life whom God raised from the dead," and, later on, by the declaration, "In the name of *Jesus Christ, the Nazoraean*, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, doth this man stand here before you whole[2]." In all these passages, and still more perhaps in one of the accounts of Paul's conversion containing the words "I am Jesus *the Nazoraean*, whom thou persecutest," most readers—if they approach these stirring announcements with a desire to realise them as if hearing them for the first time—will feel (I think) that there would be something flat in the mention of "the Nazoraean" if it only meant "born at Nazara"—a name suggesting "Where is it?"—but that it would sound an inspiriting and stirring note if it also alluded to "the ever living Prince of Life, the Nêtzer, the Branch of the Lord's Planting[3]."

As regards the Gospels, most of the instances in the Synoptic tradition have been mentioned above[4]; and it

[1] Acts ii. 22—36. Acts ii. 1—21 introduces, but does not proclaim the gospel.

[2] Acts iii. 6—15, iv. 10.

[3] Acts xxii. 8. Between this and the Petrine instances comes Acts vi. 14 "We have heard him [*i.e.* Stephen] say that this Jesus, the *Nazoraean* [as these heretics call him] (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος) will destroy this place." The other instances in the Acts are xxiv. 5 "a ringleader of the sect of the *Nazoraeans*," and xxvi. 9 "contrary to the name of Jesus the *Nazoraean*." "Nazarene" does not occur in the Greek of the Acts (in spite of xxiv. 5 R.V. "Nazarenes," as to which see p. 1, n. 1).

[4] No mention has been made of an instance peculiar to Luke, in the story of Emmaus (xxiv. 19) "the things concerning Jesus *the Nazarene*." It is the only instance of "Nazarene" in Luke (apart from Lk. iv. 34 where he closely follows Mark). Possibly Luke simply retains the form used in a narrative that he incorporates in his Gospel. But it would have a distinctive meaning if it implied that the two disciples had, for the moment, given up their Messianic hopes, and that Jesus, whom they would but recently have called "*the Nazoraean*, the Branch of the Lord's planting," had, for the moment, become to them simply "*the Nazarene*," beloved and longed for, but only as "Jesus *of Nazareth*."

should be added that an insertion peculiar to Matthew, immediately after the Riding into Jerusalem, mentions "prophet" and "from Nazareth," whereas the other three Gospels mention "king" or "kingdom" in the preceding welcome of Jesus, but Matthew does not[1]. In John, "Jesus *the Nazoraean*" is the reply twice made by the cohort and the servants of the chief priests to the question asked by Jesus, "Whom seek ye[2]?" Jesus makes, and confirms, the avowal that He *is* "Jesus *the Nazoraean*" ("I am he"). A little afterwards Pilate writes on the Cross "Jesus *the Nazoraean*, the King of the Jews," and confirms it with "What I have written I have written." The Fourth Gospel gives us the impression that the whole of the inscription was written by Pilate as God's instrument. The Synoptists do not insert in it "Jesus *the Nazoraean*." Mark has simply "the King of the Jews." Matthew and Luke add "this" or "this is Jesus[3]." What Pilate understood by "Nazoraean" we are not told. Whatever it meant, the accused had been arrested under that appellation, and would be consistently tried and executed under it, whether it meant to Romans "of the town of Nazara" (as it probably did) or "commonly called Nazoraean." But John, by making Pilate write on the Cross "Jesus *the Nazoraean*," along with "King of the Jews," certainly succeeds in conveying the impression that Providence was giving a royal glory to the former title.

From this, the last Johannine instance of "Nazoraean," let us return to the Johannine introduction of "Nazareth" in the dialogue between Philip and Nathanael, in which the latter objects to Nazareth as the Messiah's birthplace and yet

---

[1] Mt. xxi. 11; comp. Mk xi. 10, Lk. xix. 38, Jn xii. 13 "king" (or "kingdom"), Mt. xxi. 9 om. "king."

[2] Jn xviii. 5, 7.

[3] Mk xv. 26; Mt. xxvii. 37 *οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰ. ὁ β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων*; Lk. xxiii. 38 *ὁ β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος.*

accepts Jesus in spite of the objection. In the case of Philip it might well be said that the objection to "Nazareth," as the Messianic home, appeared to be not met but overridden. Are we to suppose that it was "overridden" in the case of Nathanael also? The context suggests that there may be another explanation.

It is liable to the charge of being "subtle." But it is at all events in accordance with all the facts enumerated above. In particular, it accords with the Matthaean tradition (as interpreted from Isaiah) that the residence in Nazareth was ordained in order that Jesus "might be called *the Branch*," *i.e.* the Prince of the House of David, and the Branch of God's planting. It is this—that Nathanael, an "Israelite without guile" and also learned in the Scriptures, being forced by the power of Christ's personality to receive Him as the Messiah, and yet being at the same time told that He is "from *Nazareth*," is driven at once to the same conclusion as that set forth by Matthew, namely, that the connection of the Messiah with the village of *Nazareth* was ordained "in order that He might be called *Nêtzer*."

Historically and logically Nathanael's exclamation is unjustifiable. He ought (we may say) to have waited for fuller information. Then he would have ascertained that Jesus was born in Bethlehem—which was either (as Matthew implies) the home, or (as Luke says) the lodging-place, of Joseph and Mary at the time of the birth. But the Synoptic Gospels give us no hint that the birth at Bethlehem was publicly known during Christ's life. The Fourth Gospel goes further. It gives us reasons for confidently asserting that it was *not* publicly known. It represents objections—raised by some of "the multitude," and also by "the Pharisees," that the Christ or "the Prophet[1]" could not come "out of Galilee"—as being

[1] Jn vii. 52. On the necessity of this interpretation see *Johannine Grammar* **2492**.

allowed to pass uncontradicted. In both cases, supporters of Jesus are present. Some of them had said before "This is the Christ." But they have nothing to say now. Nicodemus pleads for Christ, but when they fling in his face "Art thou also of Galilee?" he leaves the gibe unanswered[1].

Putting ourselves in the position of Nathanael, convinced that Jesus must be the Messiah, and also that He was "from Nazareth," and knowing nothing of the alleged birth at Bethlehem, could we, as Jews, with Jewish ways of interpreting Scripture, find a much better refuge—for the moment at all events—than the assumption that, if Jesus was indeed "from Nazareth," it was divinely ordained, in order that He might be "called Nazoraean," that is to say, the Branch, who was at once the Son of God and the Son of Israel?

In concluding our consideration of this very difficult question we shall do well to remember that in the transition of Christian tradition from the language of the East to that of the West, it would be natural to introduce into the former a definiteness that was not part of the original. Birthplace-names such as "the Stagirite" would not suggest to a Greek a metaphorical or mystical interpretation, or anything but plain "Aristotle." But Abram *the Hebrew*—the first mention of "Hebrew" in the Bible—is rendered by LXX as meaning that "Hebrew" was "the Crosser, or Passer, Over." R. Jehuda, commenting on this passage, implies that the Patriarch "*passed over*" from the world of falsehood to the world of truth, and Philo takes the same view[2]. Also "Elijah *the Tishbite*" is taken by the author of Horae Hebraicae as alluding to the mission of Elijah to be "the Converter[3]."

[1] Jn vii. 41—2, 52.

[2] *Light on the Gospel* 3948 foll.

[3] See *Hor. Heb.* iii. 21 (on Lk. i. 17). He adds that "the Targum and other Rabbins would have it from the city *Toshab*." But it is difficult to believe that there was not found in "*Toshab*" some allusion to the Prophet's task.

Even those who took Tishbite to mean "from Toshab" might admit that the prophet's birthplace-name was, as it were, a prophecy of the "conversion" that was to be the prophet's work. And that thoughts of this kind extended to the use of birthplace-names in the earliest traditions of the Talmud is indicated by the instances given above from *Aboth*. This general consideration should go a long way toward convincing us that Jesus was called "the Nazoraean," not "the Nazarene," by His disciples, and that Mark, in substituting the latter for the former, has committed a natural but a serious error[1].

[1] Professor Burkitt in the course of some valuable remarks about Nazareth &c. in *Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names* (published for the British Academy, 1912) says (p. 18) "It seems to me most probable that the word is really connected with נזיר and the vow of the Nazirites," adding "It is a desperate conjecture, and I would not make it, were it not that *the ordinary view of Nazareth seems to me wholly unproved and unsatisfactory*." With the words that I have italicised I heartily agree; but he adds "And the most unproved and least satisfactory part of the ordinary view is that part of it which is attested by the Syriac Versions, whereby the *z* is made to represent a Semitic צ." From this I venture to differ for the reasons given above, maintaining that the Syriac has preserved the original "Semitic צ" which belonged to *Nêtzer*.

No doubt, Professor Burkitt is right in saying (p. 28 foll.) that the Semitic צ is rarely represented by the Greek ζ. Yet he himself points out that "Zoar" (the name of the city near the Dead Sea, where Lot took refuge) is an exception, and he indicates the reasons. (1) It was a well-known place and spelt Ζοάρα or Ζωάρα by Ptolemy. (2) It was supposed to mean "Little-borough." Now "little" is spelt in Hebrew with צ (*tz*) but in Aramaic with *z*. He adds that "though ז and צ do not indiscriminately or regularly interchange, yet one or two roots containing these letters do interchange, and זער—צער is one."

Here he does not go so far as Levy in recognising the likelihood of interchange of צ and ז. Levy *Ch.* i. 209 says that the Aramaic ז is "*often*" interchanged with similar sibilants, "*especially*" *s* and *tz* ("ס und צ"), and gives an instance a little later (*ib.* 214*b*) where the Hebrew צידה "viaticum," has passed into the Aramaic זודא. If Levy is right as to this frequency of interchange, it becomes much more easy to understand how the Hebrew *nêtzer* might pass into the early Christian Church in a form that substituted *z* for *tz*. That Jewish Christians ever called

Christ "a Nazirite" seems to me in the highest degree improbable, both because Christ's manner of life was alien from such a title, and because the title had no Messianic traditions; but that the term "Nazirite"—interpreted as "the consecrated one" or "holy one of God"—was one of several causes that led Gentile Christians to misunderstand a Jewish play on the titles "Jesus *the Nêtzer*" and "Jesus *of Nazara*," seems very probable indeed.

In particular, there are the following grounds for believing that "Jesus the *Nêtzer*" would be a controversial phrase, in the first half of the first century, between Jews and Christians in disputes concerning the Resurrection of Christ. (1) According to Matthew (xxviii. 15), the Jews persistently accused the Christians of stealing the body of Jesus from the sepulchre. [According to John (xx. 2) the women for a short time believed that it had been "taken away" by others ("they").] (2) The Jewish accusers would probably apply to such a Christian theft, even though they somewhat strained the verbal prophecy, the words of Isaiah (xiv. 19) "cast forth from thy sepulchre like an abominable *nêtzer*, as the raiment of those that are slain, that are thrust through with the sword." (3) Here the LXX has "dead (*νεκρός*)" for *nêtzer*, and Aquila and Symmachus have *ἰχώρ* and *ἔκτρωμα*, implying that the body was a mangled mass of flesh and blood. (4) We have seen above (p. 10) that, according to the Talmud, the Jews used Isaiah's words to justify them in killing a certain Nêtzer, a Christian heretic. (5) Isaiah's preceding context (xiv. 13) "I will ascend (*ἀναβήσομαι*) into heaven" was applied ironically to Jesus Himself (*Notes on New Testament Criticism* **2998** (xviii) *a*) by Rabbi Abbahu (about 280 A.D.). (6) Both passages of Isaiah were referred by the Jews primarily to Nebuchadnezzar, whose pride made him boast of "ascending" to heaven, and whose apprehended resurrection from the dead caused his enemies to "thrust-through" his corpse "with the sword." From the Jewish point of view, a secondary application to Jesus was very natural. (7) On the other hand, concerning the true *nêtzer*, the *nêtzer* from the root of Jesse, the LXX—calling it "a flower"—said (Is. xi. 1) "a flower from the root shall ascend (*ἀναβήσεται*, but Heb. *lit.* 'bear-fruit')." (8) Where Mark (xvi. 6) has "*ye seek* Jesus *the Nazarene, the crucified*," the parallel Luke (xxiv. 5) has "why *seek ye the living with the dead* (*νεκρῶν*)?"

The facts suggest that the tradition on which Mark was based contained some contrast between the true and the false "*nêtzer*" to this effect: "Ye are seeking the [living and growing] *nêtzer* as [if He were the *nêtzer*] *thrust-through* [and helpless among the dead]." If so, Mark has retained *nêtzer* as "Nazarene" and "*thrust-through*" as "crucified." Luke has retained neither word, but has given something approaching to the sense of both.

CHAPTER II

THE "DISCIPLE" THAT WAS (R.V.) "KNOWN UNTO THE HIGH PRIEST[1]"

THE Fourth Gospel differs from the Three in representing Peter's denial as being the result, in part at all events, of an action proceeding not from himself, but from another—an unnamed person. According to this Gospel, though Peter followed Jesus to the High Priest's palace, he remained standing at the door outside[2]. It was natural that he should desire to learn the issue of the trial of Jesus as soon as possible, and this he could do by waiting—probably with others who had not the right of entry—outside the palace. Inside, he could do Jesus no good, and his presence there (as he must have well known) would expose him to great peril. It would also, if he

[1] Jn xviii. 15—16 (R.V.) "And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and [so did] another disciple. Now that disciple was known unto the high priest, and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest; but Peter was standing at the door without. So the other disciple, which was known unto the high priest, went out and spake unto her that kept the door, and brought in Peter." R.V. is not quite accurate. See below, pp. 24—5, n. 6 (*ad fin.*), and p. 27, n. 1.

[2] The Evangelist apparently assumes that there was one and the same *αὐλὴ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*, "courtyard of the High Priest," for Caiaphas and Annas, so that the latter occupied separate chambers from the official chambers of Caiaphas, but had no separate "courtyard." He assumes (and no doubt rightly) that the proceedings of the trial were irregular, and makes this clear at the outset by saying that the prisoner was taken "first" to "Annas"; who had no official position. To avoid the hypothesis of a change of scene from one courtyard to the other, and for other reasons, some early authorities have made transpositions of the text, *e.g.* SS arranges consecutively Jn xviii. 13, 24, 14, 15, 19—23, 16—18, 25 &c.

was arrested, prevent him from carrying word to the rest of the disciples and to the anxious women about the fate of their Master.

But some one came out of the palace and, in effect, brought Peter in. Nonnus, one of our earliest authorities for the interpretation of this passage, says that he "*took*" *Peter* "*by the hand*," and "brought him in." But the present text of the Gospel says, ambiguously, either that he spoke to the portress and *also* brought Peter in, or that he spoke to the portress, and *she* brought Peter in. Our Revised Version prefers the former, Chrysostom the latter. In either case one can see that Peter could hardly refuse the invitation. Doubtless, to accept it involved a tremendous future risk; but to refuse it involved an immediate cowardice. The unnamed disciple said, in effect, to Peter, "Do you not want to know, as I do, what they will do to the Master? You must want it. Then come in." This almost amounted to "*taking Peter by the hand and leading him in*[1]."

The question for us is, "Who thus, in effect, drew Peter into the net of temptation?" It is generally taken for granted that it was John the son of Zebedee. Chrysostom assumes this. So does Jerome. But Chrysostom, as we shall see, slightly alters the text of the Gospel so as to favour his view, and Jerome does not represent the Greek exactly. The reason for assuming it appears to be mainly this, that, later on, in connection with Peter, "*the other disciple whom Jesus loved*" undoubtedly means John; and here, in connection with Peter, the text mentions "*another disciple*," afterwards referred to as "*the other disciple*." It is perhaps natural, at first sight, to infer that "*other disciple*" when mentioned with "Peter" means John in the earlier instance because it certainly means John in the later.

[1] See below, p. 25, n. 3. Nonnus perhaps meant "taking by the hand" to imply a guarantee that the "other disciple" knew Peter. But Peter might feel the action to be, in effect, coercive.

But does it not make a difference that whereas, later on, the "*other disciple*" is called the one "*whom Jesus loved*," here the "*other disciple*" is described as (R.V. twice) "*known unto the high priest*"? Will it not make a still greater difference if we presently find (as we shall) that the phrase rendered by R.V. in the second instance "*known unto the high priest*" really means "*intimate friend*," and implies "*the friend that was in his counsels*"? For the Gospel says, in the very verse that precedes, "Now Caiaphas was *he that gave counsel to the Jews that it was expedient that one man should die for the people*." Is it likely that a Gospel written in the name of "the disciple whom Jesus loved" should say, in effect, that that disciple was "in the counsels of" the High Priest who was plotting the death of Jesus—and this on the very eve of His crucifixion?

And are there not also some *a priori* grounds for doubting whether the action assigned to the unnamed disciple is quite suitable to John? We generally think of him as thoughtful, retiring, and less impulsive than Peter. On the shore of Gennesaret, John does not swim to Jesus. He merely says to Peter "It is the Lord." It is Peter who plunges in. But here what are we to say about the conduct of this unnamed disciple in the palace of Caiaphas? To bring Peter—we may almost say with Nonnus, to "take Peter by the hand and draw him"—into a crowd of the High Priest's guards and servants[1], where he, the single one of the Twelve who had been bold enough to strike a blow for his Master, could not possibly escape notice, followed by suspicious questioning, and ultimately by detection! It may have been well intended, but was it wise and thoughtful? And when it was done, when Peter was inside, left like a hunted creature at bay amid his enemies,

[1] It has been suggested that others, attracted by curiosity, may have pressed into the courtyard, among whom Peter might have, for a time, escaped notice. That may be granted as not improbable. And it would diminish the immediate risk. But even so, the risk would be so great as to make Peter's entry explicable only by very special circumstances.

was it thoughtful or kind to desert him without a word or act of recorded helpfulness?

It may be said, "John was engaged in a higher duty. He was in the upper room, watching the trial of his Lord." But would his Lord have preferred this? Are we quite sure that He would have called it a "higher duty"? Even if John had spoken in the Lord's defence, Jesus might perhaps have preferred that he should be defending his brother disciple in his struggles with Satan who was "sifting him like wheat." But to be above and to do nothing, when he might have been below, helping the brother Apostle, whom, by his own impulsive conduct, he had plunged into temptation—was this the kind of conduct that we should expect in the disciple whom Jesus specially loved?

These considerations, it is hoped, may bespeak a patient hearing for the suggestion—not, I believe, quite novel[1], but,

[1] Alford *ad loc.* says "There is no reason to doubt the universal persuasion that by this name John intends *himself*....The idea that it was *Judas Iscariot* (Heumann), is surely too absurd to need confutation. The [ὁ] ἄλλος, συνεισ. τῷ Ἰησ., ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχ. (as a matter of individual notice), and the whole character of the incident, will prevent any real student of St John's style and manner from entertaining such a supposition for a moment."

Keim (*Jesus of Nazara* VI. 58) says "Foolish explanations of the 'other disciple' as an unknown person (Aug., Calov, Gurlitt), as a citizen of Jerusalem (Grotius), even as Iscariot (Heum.)." The sentence finishes here. I am informed that Meyer's *Gospel of John* Vol. II. p. 311, adds "Calovius and Calvin" to Augustine and Grotius, as givers of what Keim calls "foolish explanations," and as exceptions to what Alford calls "the universal persuasion."

Westcott, after remarking that the text has *another disciple*, not *the other*, says "The reader cannot fail to identify the disciple with St John." This may give to some readers, who do not "fail," a sense of their own superiority to Augustine, Grotius, and Calvin. But others, who do "fail," may be consoled by feeling that they fail with eminent men.

These three quotations appear to shew that the Judas-hypothesis has not yet received attention from "any real student of St John's style and manner" in this country.

See *Son of Man* 3460 *c* for an attempt to explain "*the High Priest*" (in

as far as I know, not hitherto presented for serious consideration in this country—that the unnamed disciple was not John but Judas Iscariot, and that this subtle, perhaps we must say this over subtle, Evangelist intended us to distinguish "*another disciple who was the friend of the High Priest*" from one whom he will describe later on as the "*other disciple whom Jesus loved.*" Both disciples are connected in a peculiar way with Peter. But the former, whatever may have been his motives, acted as Peter's enemy. The latter acted as Peter's friend. The first Johannine mention of Judas Iscariot followed a confession of Simon Peter, and was accompanied by the word "devil"; and the context implied that Judas was then acting like an instrument of Satan and endeavouring to lead Peter and the rest of the disciples astray, following after Satan[1]. Now, in the High Priest's palace, consistently with his previous attempt to mislead Peter, Judas attempts again, and on this occasion succeeds. He actually leads the foremost of the Apostles to deny his Lord. This is the work of *the "other" disciple who was the friend of the High Priest.*

How different the influence on Peter of *the "other" disciple whom Jesus loved*! He accompanies Peter to the tomb of the Lord, and outstrips him in the race. Judas drew Peter into the hall of Caiaphas, the House of Temptation. John indirectly, by emulation, stimulated Peter to go before him into the tomb of Jesus, which was the preparatory House of Faith. Later on, again, it was "that disciple whom Jesus loved" who "saith unto Peter, It is the Lord," and Peter "girt his coat about him—for he was naked—and cast himself into the sea." It seems to be implied that Peter reached Jesus before the rest of the disciples reached Him. If he did, it was thanks to "that disciple whom Jesus loved."

"known to *the High Priest*") as a name given in Christian tradition to Jesus.

[1] Jn vi. 68—71, on which see in *The Fourfold Gospel, Introduction* p. 146, the section entitled "Attraction and recoil, Peter and Judas."

Reviewing all these facts, can we not imagine that the Fourth Evangelist may have meant antithesis where we have taken him to mean identity? "How could you suppose"—he might perhaps say to us, complaining of our dulness of comprehension—"that I intended you to identify *another disciple who was the bosom friend of Caiaphas, the murderer of Jesus*, with *the other disciple whom Jesus loved?*" And this, at least, might be said in support of such a complaint, that the Johannine narrative does make the action of the unnamed disciple responsible for what followed. If the friend of the High Priest had not taken Peter into the High Priest's hall, Peter—humanly speaking—would not have denied his Master.

Passing now to an examination of the Johannine context mentioning the disciple that was a friend of the High Priest, we must be prepared to find the text varying a great deal and possibly corrupt. The points of main interest in it are emphasized in the early poetic commentary of Nonnus. For example, he repeats the thought of being "well known," *in three different meanings*, in one line thus:—(1) "[intimately] known," (2) "renowned," (3) "accustomed"[1]. A literal translation of his paraphrase of the passage may perhaps usefully prepare the reader for the difficulties of the Gospel text. Usually Nonnus agrees with Chrysostom, but in this passage they differ widely. The extract covers the ground from Peter's entrance up to the question that elicits the first of the three denials[2]:—

---

[1] For instances of such repetition called "conflation," see *Clue* 113—27.

[2] Jn xviii. 15—17, paraphrased by Nonnus xviii. 69—80. The Greek is as follows:

Ἰησοῦν δὲ φέροντες ἐπέῤῥεον ἀσπιδιῶται·
καὶ οἱ ὀπισθοκέλευθος ὁμάρτεε τηλόθι Σίμων
καὶ νέος ἄλλος ἑταῖρος, ὃς ἰχθυβόλου παρὰ τέχνης
γνωτὸς ἐὼν ἀρίδηλος ἐθήμονος ἀρχιερῆος
Χριστῷ σύνδρομος ἦλθεν ἔσω θεοδέγμονος αὐλῆς.
καὶ βραδὺς αὐτόθι Πέτρος ἐλείπετο νόσφι θυράων.

So, bearing Jesus [with them] the spearmen flowed on,
And on His track went with them afar off Simon
And a young [man][1] another companion [of Christ]—who, from his trade of fishing[2],
Being a friend[3], renowned, of the (?) accustomed[4] high priest,
Running-with Christ, came within the God-receiving courtyard;
And, tardy[5], there where he was, Peter was left, away from the portals.
But another [? the other][6] companion of Christ, moving rapidly in the covered building,

---

Χριστοῦ δ' ἄλλος ἑταῖρος ὑπωρόφιον γόνυ πάλλων
ἄνθορεν ἐκ μεγάροιο καὶ ἀμφιπόλῳ πυλαωρῷ
εἶπε καὶ ἤγαγε Πέτρον ἔσω πολυχανδέος αὐλῆς
χειρὸς ἔχων. καὶ δμωὶς ἐπεσβόλος ὄμματι λοξῷ
δερκομένη πυλαωρὸς ἀνίαχε γείτονι Πέτρῳ
τοῖον ἔπος· μὴ καὶ σὺ πέλεις Χριστοῖο μαθητής;

[1] "Young." Νέος, in this context, might conceivably mean "newly converted." But if it means "young," Nonnus may allude to the youthfulness traditionally attributed to John the son of Zebedee. "Another companion" is repeated below, with "of Christ," so that we seem obliged to supply "of Christ" here, and cannot well take the words as meaning, "and another young man, [his] companion."

[2] "Fishing." This apparently refers to the occupation of John the son of Zebedee. But how Nonnus supposed that this could make him a "friend of the High Priest" I cannot even suggest. Perhaps, however, Nonnus is here erroneously applying to John the son of Zebedee literally a tradition that was applied to Judas Iscariot metaphorically. Judas had planned, along with the High Priest, the arrest of Jesus. It might be said, therefore, that Judas and Caiaphas were united in spreading for Jesus (Eccles. ix. 12) "*the evil net*" (comp. Hab. i. 13—15 concerning "the wicked" who "catcheth" men in "his net" since they are "as the fishes of the sea").

[3] "A friend" (see below, p. 30) *lit.* "intimately known." The Greek word might also mean "renowned," and Nonnus adds the latter.

[4] "Accustomed" occurs in Nonnus (Jn xxi. 4) "he asked the seafaring *accustomed* fishermen (ἐθήμονας ἰχθυβολῆας)." Nonnus uses it very frequently, *e.g.* of "customary" gifts, home, couch, food &c. Perhaps he means that the High Priest was "familiar" to him like his own home.

[5] "Tardy" presumably implies either fear, or the knowledge that he would be refused admission, so that haste was needless. All he could do was to wait at the door to learn the issue as soon as possible.

[6] "Another" seems to make no sense, and ἄλλος "the other" would

Leapt-back[1] from the palace, and to the attendant porter[2]
Spake, and led Peter inside the spacious courtyard,
Holding him by the hand[3]. And a maid, jeering at him, with suspicious eye,
Beholding him, she [I say] that kept the gate called aloud to [? her or his] neighbour[4] Peter
Such saying [as this]—"Can it be that thou, too[5], art a disciple of Christ?"

---

make good sense. I can find no instance of the latter in Greek. But comp. Jn xx. 3 (Nonnus) ὡμάρτησε μαθητὴς Ἄλλος ὁμῶς ἐπὶ σῆμα, where the meaning must be "*the other*." Nonnus does not repeat here, as the Gospel does, "friend" and "High Priest." Here we may note that R.V. is not quite right in rendering identically, by "known *unto*," both xviii. 15 γνωστὸς τῷ (*dative*) and xviii. 16 ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ (*genitive*). The first need not, the second must, imply intimacy.

[1] "Leapt-back," a rarer meaning than "leapt-up," but required by the sense, and allowable (Steph. *Thes.*). It implies emotion or distraction in the Disciple.

[2] "Porter" (not "*portress*" which the Gospel text has). This is also the reading of SS (see below, p. 27, n. 3). The Disciple speaks to the Porter, and, to make Peter's admission sure, takes him in, as it were, under his wing. If we may suppose an interval, the Porter's maid-servant—though saying nothing at the moment, in the presence of the Porter and the Disciple—flouts Peter afterwards. Chrysostom expressly dissents from this view: "*Why did not the Disciple himself bring Peter in?* He was keeping-close to Christ and following close on Him. For this cause he bade the woman bring Peter in."

[3] "Taking him by the hand" *i.e.* as guarantee of personal knowledge. This is perhaps more probable than the view that Peter hesitated, as though saying: "I can be of no service, inside the Palace, either to my Lord or to the rest. But I would fain wait outside to learn the issue as soon as may be and let the others know of it," and as though the Disciple replied "But come in you must, for I know you wish (as I do) to see as well as to hear."

[4] "Neighbour." Does this mean that she came close to Peter and sat down near him, so that he was, for the time, her "neighbour"? Or does it mean that Peter was the "neighbour" of the other Disciple at the time of entering?

[5] "Thou, too," that is, "thou as well as thy companion." Nonnus takes this as a jibe (s. ἐπεσβόλος). Chrysostom does not; he explains "thou, too" thus: "Because John was inside"—that is, because Peter had, as his companion, inside the palace, a friend of her Master, the High Priest—and he adds "*So mildly* did she accost him."

In the Gospel narrative there are some variations in the MSS and Versions, and some also in one part of the (apparently) genuine text as compared with another part. They necessitate not only a close examination of this passage speaking of "*another* disciple" but also a comparison of it with the passage that later on speaks of "*the other* disciple[1]." The former is said to have been "known to," and "the intimate-friend of," the High Priest. The latter is said to be the one "whom Jesus was wont to love." Some inferior MSS and authorities have altered "*another*," here, into "*the other*," conforming the former to the latter—naturally, but possibly with the result of completely changing the sense. Also the Syro-Sinaitic Version, consistently, in both passages, either omits "*other*" or alters it into "*one*" or "*that*." The similarity between the Hebrew "*one*" (sometimes meaning "*a certain person*") and "*other*" is so great as to cause many errors in the LXX[2]. These facts must be remembered in studying the Johannine text, which runs thus[3]: "Now there was following Jesus Simon Peter and another[4] disciple[5]. Now that

[1] Jn xx. 2 foll. [2] See *Indices to Diatessarica* p. 22.

[3] Jn xviii. 15—17 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής. ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς (marg. γνωστὸς ἦν) τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἱστήκει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τὸν Πέτρον. λέγει οὖν τῷ Πέτρῳ ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρός Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου ;

[4] Chrys., and some inferior authorities, have "the other." Comp. Jn xxi. 2 "and *others* of [*lit.* from] his disciples *two*." Why does not John name the "two"? Is it because he was ignorant? There are reasons for conjecturing that Andrew and Philip are meant. Nonnus expressly mentions "Andrew" after "Peter," making eight instead of seven. Pseudo-Peter breaks off thus, § 14 "But I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, having taken our nets went to the sea. And there was with us Levi, the son of Alpheus, whom the Lord...." Chrys. has, freely, καὶ ἦσαν Σίμων ὁμοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου κληθεὶς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι δύο.

[5] Blass prints xviii. 15 [ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος] καὶ εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν γνωστὸς ἦν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλήν.

disciple was *friend* (lit. *known*) *to*[1] the high priest and entered in with Jesus into the court of the high priest, but Peter was standing at the door outside. There came out therefore the other disciple that was *the friend* (lit. *the known*) *of*[2] the high priest, and spoke to the portress[3] and brought in (*or*, she brought in[4]) Peter. There saith therefore to Peter the maid-servant[5] [that was] the portress, Can it be that thou also art [one] of the disciples of this man?"

---

[1] Γνωστὸς τῷ here, but ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ in the next verse, so that the text leads us perhaps from a possibility of the meaning "acquaintance," to a certainty of the meaning "intimate friend." The reading γνωστὸς ἦν τῷ ἀ. was probably intended to separate γνωστός from ἀ. and to suggest that it did not mean "friend of," but only "known to."

[2] See below, p. 30 for the proof that γνωστός in this sentence means "intimate friend."

[3] "Portress," but Nonnus and SS "porter" masc.

[4] "She brought in." So Chrys., but it is less probable than "(he) brought in." Εἰσάγω is used in the parall. Lk. xxii. 54 of bringing Jesus as a prisoner into the palace, and sim. in Acts xxi. 37, xxii. 24, and of the "leading in" of the feeble and helpless, in Lk. ii. 27, xiv. 21, Acts ix. 8. So there is something to be said for Nonnus' rendering "led, taking by the hand." But in a few N.T. instances the word means simply "introduce" (Acts xxi. 28—9, Heb. i. 6). The only other N.T. use of the word is in Acts vii. 45, of "bringing in" the tabernacle.

[5] "The maidservant." There were discussions about the Attic and the Hellenic meanings of παιδίσκη (see Steph. *Thes.*) but there can be no question about the N.T. use of the word, as always denoting a servant not free. Comp. Gal. iv. 22 foll. "one by the *handmaid* (A.V. *bondmaid*) the other by the freewoman." In Acts xvi. 16, it means a slave possessed with a spirit of divination, who brings her masters "much gain." Also note Lk. xii. 45 τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας (parall. Mt. xxiv. 49 συνδούλους) where A.V. has "maidens," but R.V. "*maidservants*." So in Acts xii. 13 A.V. "damsel," R.V. "maid," but probably "*maidservant*" employed as portress, not necessarily young (comp. Lk. xxii. 57 "*Woman*, I know him not"). All the Evangelists use παιδίσκη in this passage. But whereas they call her (Mk xiv. 66) μία τῶν παιδισκῶν, (Mt. xxvi. 69) μία παιδίσκη, (Lk. xxii. 56) παιδίσκη τις, John explains that she was "the maidservant that was the portress (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρός)."

But, if so, why did not John call her thus at once:—"he spake to *the maidservant that was portress*...then saith to Peter *the portress*"? Why write "the portress (τῇ θυρωρῷ)" first, and "the maidservant that was

We pass to the Synoptic narrative, which describes Peter's entrance as being without any intervention:

Mk xiv. 54	Mt. xxvi. 58	Lk. xxii. 54—5
And Peter had followed him afar off, even within, into the court of the high priest, and he was sitting with the officers.	But Peter followed him afar off, unto the court of the high priest, and entered in, and sat with the officers.	But Peter followed afar off. And when they had... Peter sat in the midst of them.

It will be observed that Luke (and Luke alone) describes Peter as being "*in the midst of*[1]" those whom Mark and Matthew describe as "the officers." Also John (and John alone) connects Peter's entrance with a "*portress*." Compare:

2 S. iv. 6 (Heb.)	2 S. iv. 6 (LXX)
And thither *they entered even-into the midst of* the house.	And behold *the portress* of the house.

Here LXX has the same word as John (θυρωρός), and Gesenius prefers such a reading of the Hebrew text as is implied by the LXX[2]. In Hebrew, "*porter*," or "*gate-*

portress (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς)" second? The order is hardly explicable, and it suggests that τῇ θ. is an error for τῷ θ., and that (as Nonnus and SS say) the disciple first "spake to *the porter*," and then there followed the action of "*the maidservant that was portress*," that is to say, a subordinate of the "porter." She overheard what had been said to the "porter" by the disciple of Jesus, and presently came and jested at Peter about it.

An interval may be supposed to have elapsed after the disciple has brought Peter in. The disciple leaves Peter, and departs to the upper chamber. Peter comes into the throng of servants and guards. Then the maidservant comes and asks him whether he, too—like his influential companion the friend of the High Priest—is a disciple of Jesus.

[1] Lk. xxii. 55 μέσος. Lk. has used ἐν μέσῳ in the same verse, "and when they had (*lit.*) kindled-around (περιαψάντων) (*Son of Man* **3369** *a*) a fire *in the midst of* (ἐν μέσῳ) the court."

[2] Gesen. 1045 *a*. The interchange of "*into the midst*" and "*porter*" would be easier in Aramaic than in Hebrew (Levy *Ch.* ii. 561 *b*).

keeper," is identical in consonants with "*gate*." Hence there appears to be a similarity between this confusion of "*gate-keeper*" and "*in the midst*" in Samuel, with a confusion of "*gate-way*" or "*porch*" with "*in the midst*" in Isaiah, where the Hebrew "*in the midst*" is rendered by LXX "*in the porch*[1]." This is all the more to the point because Mark alone, a little later, mentions as the scene of the second denial, "*fore-court*," and the parallel Matthew alone mentions "*porch*[2]," and the confusion between these words and "*porter*," in the LXX, is very frequent[3]. Since therefore "*in the midst*" is confused by the LXX twice with "*portress*" or "*porch*," and since "*porter*" and "*porch*" are still more frequently confused, the question arises whether this (at first sight) insignificant phrase of Luke, "*in the midst*," may not be of crucial importance in guiding us through the mazes of the narrative of the Denial as told in the Four Gospels, and also in leading us to some satisfactory explanation of the personality and action of the disciple who, as our Revised Version says, "*was known to the high priest*."

But here we must stop to ask whether "known" is an adequate rendering. The Greek word, as applied to persons, is extremely rare. It occurs in N.T. only here and in two passages where the parents of Jesus are described as searching for Him among their kindred and "acquaintance," and where "all his *acquaintance*...stood *afar off*" round His Cross[4]. The margin of the latter passage refers us to the Psalms, where the same Greek word is repeated, "Thou hast put mine *acquaintance* far from me," repeated thus, "Lover and friend hast thou put far from me, and mine *acquaintance* into darkness[5]." But even our Revisers have rightly shrunk from rendering it by "*acquaintance*," and have retained "*familiar-friend*," in the

[1] Is. lxvi. 17, LXX ἐν τοῖς προθύροις.

[2] Mk xiv. 68 προαύλιον (not elsewhere in N.T.), Mt. xxvi. 71 πυλών.

[3] The same Heb. word means (Tromm. Index p. 127 *b*) πυλών (6), πυλωρός (3): and in another form πυλωρός (28), θυρωρός (2), πύλη (6).

[4] Lk. ii. 44, xxiii. 49, γνωστός.

[5] Ps. lxxxviii. 8, 18.

complaint "It was thou, a man mine equal, my companion, and my *familiar-friend*[1]." In Greek literature it is almost non-occurrent in this sense, but in the Greek Bible, when applied to persons and used as a noun, it appears to mean this and nothing else—"intimate-friend," "a person in one's bosom" or "in one's counsels[2]." Hesychius places it as parallel to "brother[3]."

If the Greek noun is to have the signification that it has elsewhere in the Greek Bible, it ought here to mean Judas Iscariot, described first, preparatively, as "known to the high priest," and then as the "intimate partaker of the high priest's counsels." Judas had made a covenant with the chief priests to betray Jesus, and had arranged with them a plan by which the arrest might be effected without disturbance. His comings and goings during these negotiations might naturally give him an entry to the High Priest's palace, and lay him open to the Christian reproach that he, who should have been the "familiar friend" of Jesus, had made himself the "familiar friend" of Caiaphas. That was the way in which Christians might apply the words in the Psalm "It was thou...*my familiar friend*." Concerning this utterance Jerome says "It was the saying of Christ about *Judas*"; and Origen assumes it[4].

[1] Ps. lv. 13. Γνωστός occurs also in 2 K. x. 11 R.V. "*familiar friends*," A.V. txt "*kinsfolks*," marg. "*acquaintance*," Ps. xxxi. 11 "I am become...a fear to mine *acquaintance*." These are the only instances where γνωστός represents "intimately-known [friend]." In Ps. lxxvi. 1 γνωστὸς...ὁ θεός, and Is. xix. 21 "known to the Egyptians," it means "renowned," "known as a conqueror." In Prov. xxxi. 23 "her husband is *known* in the gates," LXX περίβλεπτος, Sym. has γνωστός. In Nehem. v. 10 "likewise my brethren and my *servants* (Heb. lit. *youths*, *lads*)" LXX has γνωστοί which makes better sense. The Heb. for "known" and for "youths" might be somewhat similar.

[2] Used absolutely it might mean "noble" or "renowned." Nonnus has (1) γνωτὸς, (2) ἀρίδηλος, (3) ἐθήμονος, as quoted above, p. 23, n. 2; also see Jerome *Epist.* 127 § 5, "John was *of noble birth and known to the high priest*."

[3] Steph. *Thes.* also refers to Cyrill. Lex. Ms. : γνωστοὺς, ἀδελφούς.

[4] Ps. lv. 13 (Gesen. 394 *b*) Vulg. "*notus*," on which however Jerome

If Judas brought Peter into the court of the High Priest's palace, that will explain a difficulty in the following:

Mk xiv. 66—7	Mt. xxvi. 69	Lk. xxii. 56
And as Peter was beneath[1] in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest; and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked (*lit.* looking - attentively) upon him and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, [even] Jesus.	Now Peter was sitting without in the court: and a (*lit.* one) maid came unto him saying, Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaean.	And a certain maid seeing him as he sat in the light [of the fire] and looking stedfastly upon him, said, This man also was with him.

What reason had the maid for bringing this charge? None is given by the Synoptists. Mark and Luke suggest one by the words "looking-attentively" and "looking-stedfastly upon him," as though she had seen him before. But they have not told us when or how she had seen him before.

(*inter alia*) says, in the person of Christ, "Quia me, per legis mysterium, *cognoveras esse venturum*," as though it meant "*knowing*," and on "dux" he says "*dux* dicit, propter quod Christum tradidit, *dux mortis fuit*." It is quoted by Origen (Lomm. ii. 440—1) to shew that Judas once loved Jesus (comp. *ib.* iv. 403).

[1] "Beneath," κάτω. Comp. 1 K. vi. 8 R.V. txt "*middle*," but R.V. marg. "Sept. and Targ. have *lowest*." Trommius' Index p. 131 gives consecutively (1) a word frequently meaning κάτω, κάτωθεν &c., (2) a word regularly rendered "*middle*," μέσος (7 times) but περίστυλον, "portico," once, and ὑποκάτωθεν, "below," once (as in 1 K. vi. 8). Κάτω occurs only 9 times in N.T. (setting aside Jn viii. 6—8). Its use by Mark alone here affords an additional proof of a Hebrew original. Probably the Marcan "*below*," like the Lucan "*midst*," originated in a poetic thought. Simon was not only in *the midst of* temptation, but also *sunk* or *sinking* in it, *beneath* the waters of Sheol, comp. Sir. li. 2 foll., where the writer praises God for deliverance "from flames of a fire not blown," "from cunning lips," and from temptations in which, he says, "my soul drew near unto death and my life to Sheol *beneath* (κάτω)." Κάτω, in N.T., is not used metaphorically except in Jn viii. 23, "ye are from *beneath* (κάτω)."

On the other hand, if this (R.V.) "*maid*" was really "*the portress*," and if she had often admitted Judas before to the palace while he was arranging his plans with Caiaphas, and if she now admitted Peter along with Judas, and as a companion introduced by Judas, then the "maid's" reason is easily explained, even without Mark's and Luke's "looking-attentively" and "looking-stedfastly[1]." The "friend" being a disciple of Jesus, it was natural that the maid should think Peter, too, a disciple, and perhaps, like Judas, a traitor in the High Priest's pay. And she says, either when she lets him in, or, more probably, a little afterwards, "Can it be that thou, also, (like thy companion) art one of this man's disciples?"

Here we must note that all the four Evangelists have the significant "also" ("Thou *also*" or "This man *also*") although the Fourth Evangelist alone gives us something to explain its insertion. It means "thou also *like thy companion.*" Without mention of a companion-disciple, "also" is not capable of any natural explanation[2]. This favours the Johannine narrative. But it also favours the view that the companion was Judas—whose comings and goings of late had made him familiar to

[1] "Looking attentively (ἐμβλέψασα)" and "looking stedfastly," however, may not be superfluous if they refer to the action of the portress, when seeing Peter *for the second time.* At first, while admitting Peter under the protection of "the high priest's friend," she may have simply noted his face, but said nothing. Later on, coming near Peter, she recognises his face by the light of the fire and addresses him.

[2] That is to say, if the portress had not known of the presence of *another follower of Jesus* in the palace, she would have said to Peter simply "*Thou art one* of the man's followers." But having just admitted Judas, she naturally says to Peter "*thou, also.*" Origen says, mystically (on Mt. xxvi. 69) "Forsitan autem et quicunque est in atrio Caiaphae principis sacerdotum, non potest confiteri Dominum Jesum, nisi fuerit egressus ex atrio ejus...." Most unfortunately, Origen's commentary on "the disciple that was the friend of the high priest" is lost. But we may infer from these words that, in Origen's opinion, "the disciple"—whoever he may have been—"could not confess Jesus" as long as he was in the palace. Is this easily reconcilable with the view that it was "the beloved disciple"?

the "portress"—and not John, whom we can hardly suppose to have been recently cultivating the acquaintance of Caiaphas with special assiduity.

In a previous treatise an explanation has been given of the prominence given by Luke to the phrase "*into the midst*," and of the phrase "*lighting the fire around*." Luke thinks of Peter as one "*in the midst*" of a fiery trial, a "burning" appointed "to try" the soul[1].

Historically, it is possible to combine an original "*into the midst*," or "*in the midst*," with an original in which Judas, not being deemed worthy of any other title, was called "*that one of the disciples who was the high priest's bosom friend*[2]." It is conceivable that Judas, distracted by contending emotions, after first leaving Peter at the door of the palace and going up to watch the trial, rushed back again and brought Peter in —perhaps even, as Nonnus says, taking him by the hand[3]— and there left him, in the midst of the guards and servants, to take his chance. Meantime, Judas hurried back again into

[1] See *Son of Man* **3369** *a—e*, quoting 1 Pet. iv. 12—14, and *Acta Petri* § 7, where Peter says he was "driven mad by 'the devil.'" Comp. Nonnus (on Jn xviii. 25) ἀλύων.

[2] Comp. the curious phrase in Mk xiv. 10 "Judas Iscariot *the one* of the Twelve." Here ὁ εἷς τῶν δώδεκα seems to mean "the member of the Twelve that was unique in betraying Jesus." There is also perhaps an allusion to Christ's prediction (Mk xiv. 18, Mt. xxvi. 21) "*One of you* shall betray me" (comp. Jn vi. 70 "*One of you* is a devil")—so that it might mean "*the one* of the Twelve that was pointed out by the Lord." The parall. Mt. xxvi. 14 drops "*the*" before "one." The parall. Lk. xxii. 3, "Judas, who was called Iscariot, *being of the number of the Twelve*," is perhaps a paraphrase, meaning that he was that single exception who though "*of the number of the Twelve*," was not really to be called thus, but only "Iscariot." Compare the following parallels (1) Mk xiii. 1 "*one of his disciples*," Mt. xxiv. 1 "*his disciples*," Lk. xxi. 5 "*some*"—where "*one*" might denote Judas Iscariot—impressed by the splendour of the Temple; (2) Mk xiv. 4 "*some*," Mt. xxvi. 8 "*the disciples*," Jn xii. 4 "Judas Iscariot, *one of his disciples*, he that was to deliver him up."

[3] But see *Indices to Diatessarica* pp. 21—2, shewing that the confusions between "grasp-with-the-hand (אחז)," "one (אחד)," "another (אחר)" &c. are very frequent.

the judgment-chamber to witness the result of the trial—perhaps still not without some faint and sudden hope that, after all, Jesus would be forced to resort to His miraculous powers, or would, at all events, somehow escape death. Matthew places the suicide of Judas as happening "when he saw that Jesus was condemned," so that his remorse and death (in Matthew) closely follow Peter's penitence. According to Matthew, therefore, the two Apostles—if Judas was "the high priest's friend"—were together almost up to the last moment of the life of the betrayer. The motives of Judas in leading Peter into a position of sore temptation may not have been malignant. They may even have been friendly. But, friendly or not, they turned out badly for Peter.

The same thing must be said, so far as concerns the result, if the unnamed disciple was not Judas, but that one of the Twelve whom Jesus specially loved. His action "turned out badly for Peter." And does that seem an event likely in itself, or likely to be picked out for record by the author of the Fourth Gospel though passed over by the Three? The more we reflect on the consistent conception of the quiet, thoughtful, and retiring character of the beloved disciple in the Fourth Gospel, the more difficult shall we find it to believe that he was an intimate friend of Caiaphas, or that he was made the instrument of plunging Peter into temptation by his impulsive conduct, or that the author of the Fourth Gospel intends us to believe this. Perhaps Origen's instinct led him right when he said, in his mystical fashion, that it was "impossible for a disciple of Christ to confess Jesus while he was in the palace of Caiaphas[1]." If Origen really meant this—even mystically—would he have accepted our modern view, that, at the very moment when Peter was in that palace, the beloved disciple was also there, and not only there, but there in the character of "the friend of the

[1] See p. 32, n. 2.

high priest" who had been, for days past, plotting his Master's death?

On the other side it may be urged that if Origen had believed the "other disciple" to be Judas, some record of his belief would have been preserved by other early commentators. But why? The belief of Augustine, that the "other disciple" was not John, but some unknown person, does not seem to have been preserved by other early commentators. Jerome's view—that John was "of noble birth and known to the High Priest"—indicates an early and desperate conjecture to explain an obscure passage that may well have received many early explanations not all of which have survived[1]. Such as have survived teem with inconsistencies. Chrysostom first says that it was "*a great moral triumph*" that the disciple followed Jesus when the others deserted; but then he adds that the Evangelist said that he was an acquaintance of the High Priest, "so that *no one should wonder at his following, or proclaim his praise for his bravery*[2]." Ammonius the Elder says "John went in with Jesus, along with the multitude *in the character of one unknown* [*to the High Priest*], and then *in the character of one known* [*to the High Priest*], spoke to the portress and brought in Peter[3]." The whole of Jerome's laboured explanation, quoted above, shews that kind of

[1] According to Jerome (*Letters* cxxvii. 5, ed. Wace and Schaff, p. 255) it was because John "had renounced both rank and wealth" that Jesus "loved the evangelist more than the other disciples. For John was of noble birth and known to the high priest, *yet* was so little appalled by the plottings of the Jews that he introduced Peter into his court...." Would not one have supposed that instead of "*yet*"—which I have italicised—Jerome would have written "*and consequently*"? And had not John's elder brother, James, also "renounced both rank and wealth," so that, according to Jerome's view, Jesus should have loved James "more than the other disciples"?

[2] "*A great moral triumph*," μέγα κατόρθωμα, but Cramer "*a very great wonder*," μέγιστον θαῦμα.

[3] Cramer *ad loc.* Συνεισῆλθεν ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἰησοῦ μετὰ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀγνώστως, καὶ τότε ὡς γνωστὸς εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ, καὶ εἰσήνεγκε τὸν Πέτρον.

incoherence and inconsistency which vacillates between a "nevertheless" and a "therefore."

I have not been able to find any references to this passage in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. If none can be found, there is little basis for inference as to what Alford calls the "universal opinion," so far as concerns the Ante-Nicene Fathers. But Augustine's dissent from that "universal opinion," when combined with Origen's remark on the impossibility for a disciple of Christ to confess Jesus while he was "in the palace of Caiaphas," appears to me to go some way toward demonstrating that in the first three centuries the modern view was by no means "universal," and that Origen, as well as Augustine, dissented from it.

In concluding these remarks on the Johannine account of Peter's Denial it may be well to add that, although the evidence rather favours John against the Synoptists, it must not be inferred that this favourable judgment extends to all the details and still less to the context. As regards the Johannine "*portress*," we are able to point out, not only that her introduction illuminates the whole of the Synoptic narrative, but also that there are verbal grounds for preferring it to the parallel Lucan insistence on the trial of Peter "*in the midst*" of his enemies. For we have seen that, in Samuel, modern scholars prefer the LXX "*portress*" to the actual reading of the Hebrew text "*in the midst.*" Yet in the preceding Johannine context there occurs a detail to which attention will be called in due course, where John seems to have mistaken the "going backward" and "falling away" of the *disciples*, at the moment of Christ's arrest, for the "going backward" and "falling to the ground" of *the Roman cohort.*

In view of the palpable sources of the misunderstanding

noted below[1], comment on this "going backward" is needless. John appears to have made a great mistake. But it is nothing more than a mistake. It is a misinterpretation of two or three words, every one of which can be shewn to have been ambiguous. There is no solid ground for basing on his error the charge of indifference to fact. But there is ground, here as elsewhere, for concluding that no tradition, of any Evangelist, should be accepted on the authority of that Evangelist alone, without examining its relation to Evangelistic traditions as a whole. These, as being Greek writings or translations, must of course be criticized as Greek. But this is only a secondary aspect. Primarily they are to be interpreted as the product of Hebrew and Jewish thought, and in the light of that "scripture" to which Jesus constantly refers.

Mk xiv. 50	Mt. xxvi. 56	Lk. xxii. 53—4	Jn xviii. 6
And *they* (i.e. *the disciples*) *all left him and fled.*	Then *the disciples all left him and fled.*	Omits.	*They* (i.e. *the soldiers*) *went away backward and fell to the ground.*

(1) Mark's words seem clear enough to us. But Matthew, by adding "disciples," faintly suggests that, in his opinion, some might take the original of Mark's *ἀφέντες αὐτόν* as "[the soldiers] letting go their prisoner." Luke, by omitting the whole, confirms the view that there was *some* obscurity.

(2) "Left him," *ἀφέντες αὐτόν*, is ambiguous, since it might mean "[the soldiers] letting him go [for the time]," comp. 2 Chr. xxviii. 14, 1 Macc. xiii. 16, 19.

(3) "Went backward," *ἀπῆλθαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*, is ambiguous, since it might mean that Christ's disciples went backward in the sense of falling away, or deserting Him. It is actually so used in Jn vi. 66 *ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω*. Delitzsch has in both places the same Heb. (for *ὀπίσω*) and it is connected (Gesen. 30 *b*) with (1) revolt as well as (2) repulse.

(4) "Fell," *ἔπεσαν*, is ambiguous, since the Hebrew regularly rendered *πίπτω* may mean "fall away," "desert," as in 1 S. xxix. 3, Jer. xxxix. 9. No doubt Mark's "*fled*," *ἔφυγον*, is clear enough. But see Jer. xxxvii. 13 "fall-away," *lit.* "fall," LXX here, and later on, *φεύγω*, Aq. *πίπτω*, Sym. *αὐτομολέω*.

(5) "To the ground," *χαμαί*, is added by John to *πίπτω* as it is by

the LXX in Dan. ii. 46. The LXX adds it merely for emphasis. Here, in an obscure tradition, John had also motives of clearness.

John, as has been said above, appears to have made a great mistake. But we shall make a still greater mistake if we suppose that so great a writer has erred through mere love of such hyperbole as originated the fanciful legend in the Acta Pilati of the Roman standards bowing before Jesus. John *did his best to interpret what Luke had omitted and what some early traditions had probably obscured and variously reported.* Biassed by idealism, he nevertheless did not invent, but interpreted a Hebrew original in a new way. Historically he was not justified. But he was justified by grammar as well as by conscience. And that is the great point—to shew that this extraordinary and most spiritual Evangelist did not soar above earthly considerations of fact so far as he could ascertain it.

CHAPTER III

THE INTERPRETATION OF EARLY CHRISTIAN POETRY

In previous volumes of Diatessarica it has been shewn that Hebrew poetic expressions, passing into Greek prose and interpreted prosaically, might give rise to serious misunderstandings. Recently the discovery of the Syriac poems commonly known as Odes of Solomon, but perhaps better called Songs of Solomon, has brought before Biblical students two questions. The first is, "Are we to interpret these particular poems as originally written in Syriac, or as coming to us from a Syriac version of Hebrew, or from a Syriac version of Greek?" The second is of a general character, "Will the different hypotheses of origin, in this and other similar discoveries, make any great difference in the interpretation?"

In the Ninth Part of Diatessarica, a volume entitled Light on the Gospel from an Ancient Poet, I gave reasons for thinking that the Odes came to us from Hebrew. A contrary view has been recently set forth by Dom Connolly with great ability, and fortified by definite quotations of Syriac expressions that appeared to him to correspond exactly to expressions in original Greek[1]. Although I am unable to agree with its conclusions, I am heartily grateful to Dom Connolly who, in response to an appeal of mine for

[1] *The Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1913, pp. 530—8. *Greek the Original Language of the Odes of Solomon.* By the Rev. R. H. Connolly, O.S.B.

facts, has adduced eight passages, besides repeating one previously adduced, that seem to him to present "cogent reasons for concluding not merely that the Syriac is a translation from Greek, but also that the Odes were composed in Greek." It appears to me that the discussion of these passages may be used to throw light on many obscurities that await us in the interpretation of passages in the Gospels, when we doubtfully ask ourselves, "Is this or that to be interpreted, as Greek thought, logically and literally, or as Jewish thought, poetically and metaphorically?"

If my readers learn from Dom Connolly as much as I have learned, they will be grateful to me for presenting his arguments to them, even though they find no cause for gratitude in what I have said on the other side. I proceed to take his eight new quotations in the order in which he places them, reserving to the last (§ 9) the one previously adduced.

---

§ 1. "*Without envy*"

The argument from this phrase, for a Greek original, is stated by Dom Connolly thus:—"In Ode vii. 4 we read: 'He caused me to know Himself without envy in (*or*, by) His simplicity....' Dr Harris notes that the Syriac expression 'without envy' stands for *ἀφθόνως*; and to me it appears that it evidently does so."

Later on[1] Dom Connolly quotes Dr Harris as saying "An interesting example" of the Syriac phrase as a rendering of *ἀφθόνως* "will be found in Ode 11 *v.* 6, where we read 'speaking waters touched my lips from the fountain of God without grudging' (*i.e.* abundantly[2])." It will be observed that Dr

[1] *Journ. Theol. Stud.* p. 536.

[2] Dom Connolly is quoting from Dr Harris' introduction to the second edition, p. 47. In his textual rendering (second ed. p. 105) Dr Harris has "plenteously." "Fountain of God" should be "fountain of the Lord," see p. 65, n. 1.

Harris gets rid of the negation "without," and of the moral thought of "grudging," by paraphrasing the two words as one, "abundantly." Dom Connolly adopts this positive paraphrase by adding, in words that I italicise, "*Here the context requires the really positive idea which ἀφθόνως expresses, but which the Syriac does not express.*" Now I admit that ἀφθόνως—unless used in special contexts which we shall consider later on—would naturally mean "abundantly" and nothing more. Thucydides and Polybius use it of darts showered "abundantly" on the enemy, and Athenaeus of cakes "abundantly" soaked in honey[1]. That being the case, if I believed that the Poet himself wrote in Greek using ἀφθόνως in its ordinary Greek sense, I should say that "abundantly" (with a footnote attached) was the best translation, and that "without grudging," though a literal rendering of the Syriac, misled the English reader.

But if the Poet wrote in Hebrew then the aspect of the phrase is completely changed. For then we shall have to ask whether this is not one of many instances of Hebrew negative thought about the gifts of God. They are given "*with-not* (i.e. *without*) money and *with-not* (i.e. *without*) price"; they are "*without* repentance"; they are given by One who "upbraideth *not*[2]." Ben Sira also says "Buy her [*i.e.* the truth] for yourselves *without* money[3]." It is as a climax of this Hebrew negative contrast that Jesus says "*Not* as the world giveth give I unto you[4]." Philo writes in Greek but thinks in Hebrew when he says "God is *not* a tradesman selling his goods at a profit but a Being that would fain give all things, pouring-up (*sic*) the everflowing streams of graces, *not* craving an exchange[5]."

When Paul bids the Corinthians give "*not grudgingly* or of necessity," he is but carrying on the Hebrew doctrine that

[1] See Steph. *Thes.* i (2) 2651.
[2] Is. lv. 1, Rom. xi. 29 ἀμεταμέλητα, Jas. i. 5.
[3] Sir. li. 25 *lit.* "with-not money."
[4] Jn xiv. 27.
[5] Philo i. 161 "pouring up"=ἀναχέων.

God said to the Israelite "Beware that there be *not a base thought in thine heart...and thine eye be evil* against thy poor brother....Thou shalt surely give him, and thine heart *shall not be grieved* (lit. *shall not be made evil*) when thou givest him[1]." And all Christians know how Jesus emphasized this ancient Hebrew warning that the "eye" of the true Israelite must *not* be "evil[2]."

We shall shew, later on, that Philo and the earliest of the Christian Fathers connect the thought of "*grudging*" or "*envy*" with the thought of the Tree of Life in Paradise, protesting that God *did not* "*grudge*" *His best gifts to Man.* Passing over that for the present, we may here note that "*pouring-up streams*" refers to the "stream" that "*went up*" in Paradise (according to LXX and Philo) to water the earth[3]. This (said Philo) was the Mind, the Controlling Power in man, the source through which God dispenses to him His gifts and graces.

Now a reference to the other uses of "without *envy*"—which I will venture to render "without *grudging*[4]"—throughout the Odes, suggests that it is used in connection with a Tree of Life or a Fountain of Life which the Poet regards as being in the midst of Paradise. This Tree of Life is also the Tree of Knowledge, the Knowledge of God Himself. As regards the Tree of the Knowledge of good and evil, God might be said by sceptics like Celsus to have broken His own rule against "muzzling" the ox that "treadeth out the corn[5]."

---

[1] 2 Cor. ix. 7 μὴ ἐκ λύπης, Deut. xv. 10 (LXX) οὐ λυπηθήσῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου.

[2] Mk vii. 22, Mt. vi. 23, Lk. xi. 34.

[3] Philo i. 249, 573, quoting Gen. ii. 6 R.V. "mist," but LXX and Philo πηγή, Aq. ἐπιβλυσμός.

[4] A different Syriac word is used in Ode vii. 23 "And hatred shall be thrown from the earth, and together-with *envy* shall it be drowned (*or*, sunk)."

[5] Deut. xxv. 4. The Heb. verb for "muzzle" which occurs only there (see Gesen. 340 *b*, which rejects Ezek. xxxix. 11) is identical with the Syr.

and to have "muzzled" Man. For He placed it in the midst of Eden and yet forbade him to eat of it. But as regards the Tree of that higher Knowledge which is Life and which is also God's Love, there is, for the disciples of the Messiah, "*no muzzling*," or "*no grudging*." "Walk ye," says the Poet, "in the knowledge of the Most High *that is without grudging*." This—the last instance of the phrase—is to be explained by the preceding one, "Put on [thyself] the good-grace of the Lord *that is without grudging*, and come into Paradise, and make thee a crown from His tree, and put it on thy head[1]." This is typical of Abraham (who abandoned the worship of idols and of the stars and was "justified by grace"); and so, too, is a preceding instance "I have left the way of error and have come to Him and have received from Him redemption *that is without grudging*[2]." The same thought is expressed thus under the metaphor of a fountain, probably regarded as being in the midst of Paradise, "And speaking water touched my lips from the fountain of the Lord *that is* [*poured forth*] *without grudging*[3]." Passing from these instances to the earliest one of all, we find in them grounds for believing that in this, too, the metaphor is somewhat, though not quite, similar. The Poet seems to begin his poems with a conception of a Tree of Life or Love which is the Lord Himself and in which human souls, the "members" of the Tree, "hang" as branches. Ode i and Ode iii say "The Lord is on my head like a crown, nor shall I be apart from Him...Thou livest upon my head, and thou hast blossomed upon my head. Thy fruits are full and perfect, full of thy salvation....[4] I put on. And His

"envy" or "grudge." The noun-form occurs in Ps. xxxix. 1 R.V. "a bridle," or, "a muzzle."

[1] Odes xxiii. 4, xx. 7.

[2] Ode xv. 6, comp. xvii. 12 "I gave my knowledge that is without grudging," *i.e.* the knowledge of God, as Life and Love.

[3] Ode xi. 6. Comp. Rev. xxii. 1—2 "And he shewed me a river of water of life...*in the midst of the street thereof*."

[4] Here Ode i ends, probably incomplete. Ode ii and the first words of Ode iii are missing. But we may infer from Ode xx. 7, quoted above,

members are with Him and in them do I hang...And I shall not be a stranger[1] because there is *no grudging* with the Lord...."

Dom Connolly then passes to consider the phrase "*in His simplicity*," which follows "*without grudging*." "Why," he asks, "is the expression used? If we translate it literally into Greek we seem clearly to have the answer: (ἐν) τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτοῦ is 'in His bounty' (2 Cor. viii. 2, ix. 11, 13; and ἁπλῶς Jas. i. 5), and this is precisely what the context requires." Similarly he would render the same Syriac word by "generous" in Ode xxxiv. 1 where Dr Harris has "No way is hard where there is a *simple* heart."

But even if we accept the hypothesis of an original Greek ἁπλότης, we must not forget that it always implies "singleness" as opposed to doubleness or duplicity. Dom Connolly refers to 2 Cor. viii. 2 for the meaning of "bounty," but the context shews that τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἁπλότητος αὐτῶν must be explained from *ib.* 5 "*they gave themselves first to the Lord, and to us through the will of God.*" Origen explains Rom. xii. 8 ὁ μεταδιδοὺς ἐν ἁπλότητι by saying (*ad loc.*) that a man must not seem to be benefiting the needy while in his heart he is seeking praise from men—must not "*seem to be doing one thing* with his hands, while he is *really doing another thing* in his heart." That is to say, he must not be guilty of duplicity. He must be singlehearted. And so elsewhere. In N.T., ἁπλότης never means "bounty" or "liberality," in the popular sense of either word—apart from "singleheartedness."

---

that the object of "put on" is, or corresponds to, a branch, or garland, from the Tree. There is room, however, for more than one view. It may be (as in the Pauline Epistles) "putting on" Christ, the New Man &c., or it may be "putting on" the grace of Christ. And the "branches" may be the fruits, gifts, or graces of Christ. See *Light on the Gospel* **3670** foll.

[1] Comp. Eph. ii. 19 "no more strangers," where, as here, there is the thought of "one body" on "the cross." But the Epistle passes on to liken the body to a building; the Poem likens it to a tree.

I have given reasons elsewhere[1] for preferring to render the Syriac (a form of *psht*) by some form of "*single*," meaning "*singleness*" in the sense of "*singlehearted kindness to man* or *love to God*," without that latent streak of self-interestedness which often makes a man "doubleminded." In this sense, the Syriac *psht* occurs in Christ's phrase about the "*single* eye[2]," where Delitzsch has a form of the Hebrew *tôm* (literally *completeness, soundness*). The adjective *tâm*, applied to Jacob in Genesis, is rendered by Aquila ἁπλοῦς[3]. The longer form of the root *tôm* used by Delitzsch—identical, when unpointed, with what is called in R.V. *Thummim*—is used in God's precept to Abraham, "Be thou *perfect*," and is rendered by Aquila τέλειος[4]. Onkelos renders *tôm* and *tâmîm* by a form of *shalem*. This, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, often implies "soundness"—in the sense of freedom from such blemish or unsoundness as makes a thing not really what it professes to be. In the precept, "Be ye therefore *perfect*[5]," Delitzsch has a form of *shalem*[6]. In the two instances in which ἁπλότης represents a Hebrew word in O.T. it does not mean liberality, but "*singlemindedness*[7]."

---

[1] See *Light on the Gospel* **3760** *d.*

[2] Mt. vi. 22. [3] Gen. xxv. 27.

[4] Gen. xvii. 1, LXX ἄμεμπτος.

[5] Mt. v. 48, see *Son of Man* **3482** *a.*

[6] So ed. 1878. I am informed that in ed. 1877 Delitzsch has *tâmîm*.

[7] In 2 S. xv. 11, it means that the followers of Absalom were honestly deceived, and had no dishonest purpose. In 1 Chr. xxix. 17, the LXX means "*in singleness of heart* [*and without desire to bribe the Lord or receive reward*] *I willingly-gave* all these things...." The Heb. has "*uprightness* of heart." The first part of the verse says "Thou *triest the heart* and hast pleasure in *uprightness*." Not the "abundance" of the offering but the "singlemindedness" is emphasized. Comp. the use of "*perfect*" (a form of *shalem*) in *ib.* 9 "with a *perfect* heart they *offered-willingly* to the Lord, where Rashi says "*With one heart* they gave, with a well-wishing mind, *not with two hearts*; for there is a giver that gives unwillingly (not a well-wisher) or because he is ashamed of others. And such a man is called by the name of '*two-hearted*.'"

In support of his view Dom Connolly alleges Jas. i. 5. This is rendered by R.V. "Let him ask of God, who giveth to all *liberally* (ἁπλῶς) and upbraideth not." Delitzsch renders ἁπλῶς by a form of the Hebrew word (*nâdab*, "incite" or "impel") used by David in Chronicles, as above quoted, when he says, about his preparations for the Temple, "I *willingly-gave* (lit. *followed my own impulse in giving*) all these things[1]." The Hebrew *nâdab* is applied to those who "volunteer." *Nâdîb* is a name for a "prince," because the profession of a prince is to be a "volunteer" and take the lead for the service of his subjects. Accordingly Delitzsch has "He giveth to all *with willingness and with* [*there-is*] *no rebuking*." The Hebrew used here by Delitzsch, for "*rebuking*," occurs—among several instances of rebuking encroachments of various kinds—in Ruth, where Boaz says to his reapers "Pull out some [wheat] for her from the bundles, and leave it, and let her glean, and *rebuke* her not[2]." The picture of Ruth, the stranger, amid the reapers of her future husband, treated as a friend or native, and allowed to do something more than ordinary "gleaning," and this *without* "*rebuking*," may illustrate the thought of a passage in the Odes where "*no grudging*" occurs for the first time: "Dearly-love I the Beloved, and [indeed] my soul loveth Him. And where His rest [is], there also am I. And I *shall not be a stranger*, because there is *no grudging* with the Lord [Most] High and [Most] Compassionate[3]."

In concluding these remarks on the phrases "no grudging" and "singleheartedness," I by no means go so far as to assert that the considerations urged above prove that the poet wrote in Hebrew; but I do venture to assert that they effectually meet the arguments alleged from these phrases to shew that he wrote in Greek. And I think many will feel that the

[1] 1 Chr. xxix. 17, quoted above.
[2] Ruth ii. 16, comp. Gesen. 172 *a*.
[3] Ode iii. 5—7.

hypothesis of a Hebrew original, or at all events of what may be called an undercurrent of Hebrew allusion, helps us to do justice to the Odes as poetry. It is a poor thing to say that God gives "abundantly," as compared with the saying that He gives like a Father who "grudges nothing" that is for the good of His children, in spite of their frequent ingratitude. And to speak of God as "liberal," or as giving "liberally," is less beautiful (as well as less Hebraic) than to speak of His "heart" as being "single" in its love for man[1].

We shall return to this subject later on, when we deal with "Alleged translation from Greek words with privative alpha," shewing that Philo certainly, and the Book of Wisdom probably, connected God's giving of the highest knowledge with the thought of "freedom from grudging," in a very definite sense, meaning a great deal more than that He gave "abundantly."

§ 2. "*Thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood of thy soul*[2]"

[Codex N inserts "*by*" before the noun interpreted "blood" (or, by some, "price"). But, as Dom Connolly does not adopt that reading, I pass it by. I have ascertained, however, that the facsimile of Dr Harris' MS agrees with Codex N in inserting "by." Dom Connolly was under the erroneous impression that they agree in rejecting "by," and four of his arguments—those specified below as from *a* to *d*—are based on that error.

After this Chapter was in type, I heard from Dom Connolly, to whom I had written on the subject, that his mistake was caused, in part, by a somewhat obscure footnote in Dr Harris' second edition. But still, as his allegations

[1] See *Light on the Gospel* **3718** foll. on "God's 'heart' and Man's 'faith,'" and **3999** *b*—*d* where it is contended that "The 'way' of 'the simple heart'" lays an "emphasis on singleness of heart" which "illustrates other passages in the Odes mentioning the 'heart' of God."

[2] Ode xx. 5 as quoted by Dom Connolly.

under the four headings are of general interest as bearing on the relation between Greek and Hebrew thought, I have not cancelled my observations on them.]

It is alleged by Dom Connolly that (*a*) "the blood of thy soul" is merely the Syriac way of saying "thine own blood"; that (*b*) "acquire...soul" is a Syriac "translation of the Greek οὐχ ἕξεις (or the like) ἀλλότριον τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα"; that (*c*) the Greek ἕξεις meant "regard"; that (*d*) the Greek αἷμα meant "flesh and blood"—so that the meaning was "thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own (flesh and) blood"; that (*e*) the passage, with its context, alludes to one in Isaiah "When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh" (R.V.), where "for the second clause the LXX has καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψῃ"; that (*f*) a later verse in the Ode alludes to the same passage in Isaiah; that (*g*) the Ode and the LXX of Isaiah both mention "fatness," where the Hebrew of Isaiah and the Syriac of Isaiah have a different word. The conclusion is, "If then the Odist is dependent on Isaiah here, he must have used the LXX: in other words, this Ode was composed in Greek."

These arguments deserve careful and separate examination. If they were sound, they would seem to me to establish the conclusion that "the Ode was composed in Greek." But most or all of them appear to me to be unsound.

(*a*) "Thy blood" occurs, in Hebrew, thrice, in the phrase "thy blood be upon thy head," and "the dogs shall lick thy blood," and several times (in different contexts) in Ezekiel. In not a single one of these instances is it rendered in Walton's Syriac by "the blood of thy soul[1]." It is therefore,

[1] 2 S. i. 16, 1 K. ii. 37, xxi. 19, Ezek. xvi. 22, xix. 10 &c. See Mandelkern p. 298. According to my view, the Syriac of the Odes is a very early and pre-literary rendering of Hebrew, so that the Syriac of O.T. is peculiarly well adapted to illustrate the Syriac of the Odes.

to say the least, unsafe to say that the Syriac phrase here is "merely the Syriac way of saying 'thine own blood'."

(*b*) The Syriac "acquire" is said to be a translation of the Greek ἕξεις which meant "have" in the sense of "regard" but was wrongly taken to mean "have" in the sense of "acquire." But the Syriac Thesaurus, though it gives multitudes of instances of "acquire" as a rendering of ἔχω, gives none, as far as I can find, where the Greek means "regard."

(*c*) In the few instances in N.T. where ἔχω means "regard," the Syriac does not use the word "acquire[1]." Moreover a later Ode, using a different word for "regard," has "I was *regarded by them as a stranger*," as though to shew that, if the meaning had been "*regard as a stranger*," the translator knew other words to express it[2].

(*d*) The Greek αἷμα may be used in various *adverbial phrases* to denote blood-relationship, but the use of *the noun to signify a blood-relation* would seem to be rare and highly poetical. Indeed we should have to pronounce it non-existent, if we trusted in Stephen's Thesaurus. It quotes no Greek instance at all, but only Virgil's "projice tela manu, *sanguis meus*[3]."

---

[1] See Mk xi. 32 and parallels, also Lk. xiv. 18, Philipp. ii. 29, Philem. 17. The sentence "[Thou] that possessest things impossible [as] possible" quoted by Dom Connolly from the Syriac 'Anaphora of St James' seems to me—having regard to the Hebrew use of "possess" or "purchase" in a sense approaching to "create," "bring into being"—intelligible as it stands, "Thou that dost call into being things [that men would have called] impossible." No doubt "create" would be a more usual and obvious word than "purchase"; but "purchase" has associations (Gesen. 889 *a*) with God's victorious redemption that would make the word appropriate here.

[2] Ode xvii. 6. The word there used for "stranger" is a form of ξένος, different from the word in the passage under consideration.

[3] The *Thesaurus* wrongly says "Sed tamen et pater filium vocat *sanguinem* suum, ut Od. ii. 300 εἰ ἐτεόν γ' ἐμός ἐσσι καὶ αἵματος ἠμετέροιο." It adds, however, the correct translation "*e* meo *sanguine*," and then quotes Virgil *Aeneid* vi. 836, and vernacular Italian, "*Sangue mio*."

It is asked, "Does not this phrase in itself involve a Grecism? Is there any Hebrew authority for the use of 'blood,' like 'flesh,' in the sense of kith and kin?" To both these questions the answer is negative. First, it does not involve a Grecism; secondly, there is no Hebrew authority for the use of blood to mean kith and kin. But the conclusion should be "*Therefore we must render 'the blood of thy soul' here as having nothing to do with 'kith and kin'.*" It might allude to some phrase where the shedding of blood is implied—such as that in Genesis, where both the Hebrew and the Syriac insert "souls," "Your blood, [*the blood belonging*, or, *according*] *to your souls*, will I require[1]."

(*e*) "A general parallelism" is said to be indicated between Isaiah lviii and Ode xx. "The unacceptable fast" and the conditions for an "acceptable fast," in the Prophecy, are placed as parallel to "the acceptable sacrifice" and the conditions for it in the Ode. Then it is said that "there is a good deal more than this general parallelism," and the texts are put side by side to shew it:—

Isaiah lviii. 7	Ode xx. 5, 6
"When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh" (R.V.).	5 "Thou shalt not regard as an alien thine own blood, neither shalt thou seek to devour thy neighbour, 6 neither shalt thou deprive him of the covering of his nakedness."

Then it is inferred, first, that the Odist is borrowing from Isaiah, and subsequently (from the context in the Ode and the context in Isaiah) that he is borrowing from the rendering of Isaiah as given by the LXX which differs from the Hebrew.

Now of course a very important part of this "general parallelism" and of these apparent coincidences—namely, that between "*thine own flesh*" and "*thine own blood*"—altogether

[1] Gen. ix. 5. The Syr. omits "to" and has "your blood that [is] of your souls."

disappears when we adopt the correct reading in the Ode as above described, "*acquire with the blood of thy soul.*" Nevertheless it appears to me that Dom Connolly would have been safe in inferring that the Poet had Isaiah in view. But I do not think he is right in making Isaiah alone responsible for what he calls "a momentary outburst of realism, in *vv.* 5 and 6, which is quite unlike the Odist's usual manner."

Because the Poet had Isaiah in view, does it follow that he had Isaiah alone in view? There is a passage in Exodus which Isaiah himself may well have had in view. It forbids the Israelite to deprive his neighbour of his garment at night, "for it is his only *covering*[1]." And the context in that passage implies a prohibition to "devour" one's "neighbour" by usury[2]. I should add therefore that the Poet is probably looking back to both passages, to the Law as well as to the Prophet. The Law, in two respects, agrees more closely than the Prophet with the text of the Ode. For the Law, like the Ode, mentions sacrifice; and the Law, like the Ode, is negative, not positive. It begins by prohibiting sacrifice to strange gods[3], and goes on to prohibit the affliction of strangers, widows, and the poor. Isaiah makes no mention of sacrifice. But the first four verses of the Ode ("I am a priest of the Lord...nor thy soul do violence to soul") imply that it is on righteous sacrifice that the Poet bases his prohibitions of unrighteousness.

(*f*) It is suggested that the words of the Ode "and glory [cod. N. His glory] shall go before thee[4]" allude to words in the Prophecy "and *thy righteousness* shall go before thee." But the thought is different. Whatever reading we may

[1] Exod. xxii. 26—7 "If thou at all take thy neighbour's garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it...for that is his only *covering*," where the Syr. for "*covering*" is the same as in the Ode.

[2] Comp. Exod. xxii. 22 "ye shall not afflict any widow," and Mk xii. 40 &c. "devour widows' houses."

[3] Exod. xxii. 20 "He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the Lord only, shall be utterly destroyed."

[4] Ode xx. 8.

adopt, the "glory" is presumably God's. And "God's glory" is not man's "righteousness." The Poet seems to me to have in view many passages where the Lord, or the glory of the Lord, sometimes manifested in a pillar of fire or cloud, is regarded as going before His people, *e.g.* "The Lord hath made bare His holy arm...*the Lord will go before you*," and "*the glory of the Lord* shall be revealed[1]."

(*g*) A further allusion to the LXX of Is. lviii is alleged in the Ode's context, "come into His Paradise...and thou shalt *be fat* in [the?] truth in the praise of His name[2]," corresponding to Is. lviii. 11 LXX "and thy bones *shall be made fat* (πιανθήσεται) and shall be as a garden well-watered (μεθύων)" where the Hebrew has "and the Lord *shall make-strong* thy bones." From this agreement with the LXX it is argued, and with great apparent cogency, "If then the Odist is dependent on Isaiah here, he must have used the LXX: in other words, this Ode was composed in Greek."

But it should have been added that Walton's *literal rendering of the Hebrew in Isaiah* is "impinguabit," "*will-fatten*." And this is the first of three interpretations of the word mentioned in Ibn Ezra's commentary on the passage. Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus give three distinct renderings. The LXX "*fatten*" is a fourth. The R.V. "make strong" is a fifth. Why should not the Odist—even supposing that he was alluding to this passage in Isaiah alone, and to no other similar passage in Scripture—have adopted that interpretation of the Hebrew which is placed first by Ibn Ezra and (I am informed) by Kimchi? Surely, in the face of these facts, it is unsafe to say "he must have used the LXX."

[1] Is. lii. 10—12 and xl. 5. I should be disposed to add Is. lviii. 8 "the glory of the Lord shall be thy rearward."

[2] Ode xx. 7 "His Paradise": so Dr Harris' English text, but his Syriac, and Harnack's German, have "Paradise." Also "His *name*" is an error for "His *holiness*."

I do not, however, believe that the Odist is alluding to Isaiah alone. If that had been the case, I think he would have given Isaiah's phrase in full, "he shall *make fat thy bones*" or "*thy bones shall be made fat*"—expressions found in Proverbs and Ben Sira[1]—instead of "*thou shalt be fat.*" Moreover, what is the meaning of "*fat...in the praise of His holiness*"? It seems to need some explanation not to be gleaned from the context of Isaiah.

Now there are only two places in Scripture where the adjective "fat" is applied to man—one, in a neutral sense, "the fat ones of the earth," but the other in a good sense applied to the righteous man who is as it were "*fat*," *and flourishing, to the glory of God*: "They shall still bring forth fruit in old age; *fat and green shall they be, to proclaim that Jehovah is righteous*[2]." The latter is applied by several Jewish traditions to Abraham. His "*fatness*" was to the glory of God, and his connection with Paradise is recognised in Luke's Parable of Dives and Lazarus, as well as in Jewish literature in general and the Odes in particular[3]. The Psalmist, then, and not the LXX of Isaiah, may very well have been in the Poet's mind when he says to the soul, typified by Abraham, "Thou shalt receive of His kindness and of His grace[4], and *thou shalt be fat* in [the?] truth in the praise of His holiness." In any case the language does not necessitate, or even indicate, a Greek original[5].

---

[1] Prov. xv. 30 (xvi. 2), Sir. xxvi. 13.

[2] Gesen. 206 *b*, referring to Ps. xxii. 29, xcii. 14—15.

[3] See *Light on the Gospel* **3873** *c*, **3875** *e*. Comp. Ps. xxxvi. 8 "They shall be abundantly satisfied with the *fatness* of thy house; and thou shalt make them drink of the river of thy pleasures"—apparently alluding to Paradise as well as to the Temple (*Light* **3853—5**).

[4] See *Light on the Gospel* **3822**. It is in connection with Abraham that God's "kindness and truth" are first mentioned, and his name is also closely connected with "grace."

[5] Space does not admit of an attempt to shew how the words rendered above "thou shalt not acquire an alien the blood of thy soul" might be

§ 3. "*And those that were silent became with speech*[1]"

This is Dom Connolly's rendering of a sentence (in Ode xii) rendered by Dr Harris: "And in the word [*mellĕthā* here] were those that were silent." The Ode treats of the Word. A previous verse called it *pethgāmā*, saying "the swiftness of *the Word* (*pethgāmā*) is indescribable." The present verse says "And by it [i.e. *the pethgāmā*] the worlds spoke one to another, and"—according to Dom Connolly's rendering—"those that were silent *became with*[2] *speech* (*mellĕthā*)." The words that I have italicised he explains as meaning "acquired the power of speech, became vocal," adding "I am now confident that this is the true meaning,

---

interpreted on the hypothesis of a Hebrew original. I believe, but cannot at present prove, that the text is corrupt, and that, if it could be restored, it would imply a prohibition of the worship of "a strange god" (*lit.* "provoking with a stranger").

The following facts seem to me to point in that direction. (1) The word used here for "*stranger*" is found (*Thes.* 2380) masc. in Deut. xxxii. 16, meaning "*strange* [*gods*]," and fem. in Lev. xx. 2—5, meaning "*Molech*." (2) In Deut. xxxii. 16 "they *provoked* him with strange [gods]," the Heb. for "*provoke*," or "*make-jealous*," is the causative of קנא. This is confused with "*acquire*" (קנה) in Ezek. viii. 3 by Theod. "the image of the jealousy of *the acquirer*" (Heb. "the image of jealousy *which-maketh-jealous*"), and in Prov. iii. 31 by LXX "*acquire* not" (Heb. "*envy* not"). (3) Conversely, in Is. xi. 11 Heb. "*acquire* (i.e. redeem)" is rendered by LXX ζηλοῦν "*be jealous for*." (4) Levy *Ch.* ii. 372 *a* gives קנא (as well as קני) as meaning "acquire" &c.; and in Deut. xxxii. 6 "He that possessed thee," where Onk. paraphrases with "thou art *His* (דיליה)," Jer. I and Jer. II have forms of קנא. (5) The causative of Heb. קנא occurs (Gesen. 888 *b*) only in four passages (Deut. xxxii. 16, 21, Ps. lxxviii. 58 and Ezek. viii. 3), and is, in each of the four, associated with the thought of "strange [gods]," "no-god," "idols" &c. (6) A prohibition of idolatry would accord with the parallelism noted above between the Ode and Exod. xxii. 20 foll., which prohibits sacrifice to "any god save unto the Lord only."

[1] Ode xii. 8.

[2] Dom Connolly adds, in a note, "The Syriac preposition 'in' may also be translated 'by' or 'with,' as the context requires."

and I believe that the Syriac of *v.* 8[b] is merely an attempt at translating literally *καὶ τὰ ἄφωνα ἔμφωνα ἐγένετο.*"

We must carefully distinguish this conclusion from one that would accept the rendering "those that were silent *became in discourse*, or *converse*," i.e. discoursed or conversed together—taking *mellĕthā* to mean Logos, in a somewhat different sense (it is true) from *pethgāmā*, but still Logos. Dom Connolly (*a*) pins himself to *φωνή* as the ground for (*b*) an assonance between *ἔμφωνα* and *ἄφωνα*. "Similar assonances," he adds, "emerge in the most obvious way," namely (*c*) Ode xxi. 3 "grace and joy," which he would trace to an original *χάριν καὶ χαράν*, and (*d*) Ode xxx. 6 "And it (the fountain of living water) came *undefined and unseen*...," where, he says, "the italicized words are quite literally *ἀόριστος καὶ ἀόρατος*..."

(*a*) If *mellĕthā* were the rendering of *φωνή*, should we not expect to find instances of this correspondence in the Thesaurus? But in the vast space devoted (coll. 2110—3) to the noun, it is said to represent *λόγος*, *ῥῆμα*, *φθέγματα*, *λαλιά*, and *λέξις*, but not once *φωνή*. Now *φωνή* is to be sharply distinguished from *λόγος*. The Fourth Gospel says that John the Baptist is a *φωνή*, intending us to distinguish that *φωνή* from the *Λόγος*. Ignatius makes the same distinction. As a martyr, in Christ, he will be (he tells us) a *logos*; outside martyrdom, he will be a mere "cry" or *φωνή*[1]. Except in very special contexts, *φωνή* would not mean "speech" in the sense of "converse" or "discourse."

What the Poet means is that those aeons which were once silent, now at last, in the sphere of the redemptive Word, or Logos, became themselves *λογικοί*, or *ἐν λόγῳ*. The Fourth Gospel says "Whatever is called into existence in Him," *i.e.* in the Logos, "was life." This Ode, distinguishing between the creative Logos and the redemptive Logos, says that the silent aeons "*became in the Logos*" in a new sense,

[1] See *Son of Man* **3628** *d*.

namely, "*in a harmonious concord or converse*,"—something very different from a mere φωνή or "cry[1]."

(*b*) As to the alleged assonance between ἔμφωνα and ἄφωνα, it is disposed of, if the preceding paragraph is correct, because the *thought* is not concerned with φωνή. But we may add that ἔμφωνος, according to the Greek Thesaurus, is not found in the sound text of any author earlier than Ælian (c. 250 A.D.).

(*c*) Ode xxi. 3 "grace and joy" is commented on as being "exactly χάριν καὶ χαράν." But are such assonances characteristic of the best Greek religious poetry? The LXX, at all events (which Dom Connolly believes to have been used by the Odist) though it contains many beautiful combinations of χάρις and of χαρά with other words, never combines the two[2].

§ 4. "*I believed, therefore I was at rest*[3]"

On this passage Dom Connolly says "I find it hard to believe that we have here a purely accidental coincidence with the LXX." His argument is as follows: "The Ode says, 'I believed, *therefore*,' in the same Syriac words which translate ἐπίστευσα διό in 2 Cor. iv. 13 (= Ps. cxv. 1[4]); while in the Psalm neither the Hebrew nor the Syriac version of it expresses 'therefore'."

[1] See *Johannine Grammar* **2596**. And note Rom. xii. 1 and 1 Pet. ii. 2 λογικός, and Justin Martyr's frequent assumption that God, through the Logos, has made men λογικοί (*e.g. Apol.* § 10) with a view to their redemption.

[2] Another assonance is suggested, ἀόριστος καὶ ἀόρατος, as the original of Ode xxx. 6 "[the fountain of living water] came *undefined and unseen*." Ἀόριστος is not among the score of epithets of the Spirit in Wisd. viii. 22—3, and it does not occur in the LXX, the N.T., the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists. It is also often used in a bad sense. But I have found it in Clem. Alex. 857 applied to the love of God as being "unlimited." *Thes. Syr.* 2550 gives the Syriac word, with neg., as ἄπειρος and perhaps ἀπέραντος, but not as ἀόριστος.

[3] Ode xxviii. 4.

[4] Ps. cxvi. 10 in Heb. and R.V.

But there are special circumstances to be considered. The Syriac of the Psalm has "I believed *and* I spoke." Aquila has "*because* I shall speak." Field renders the Hebrew "*etiamsi* dicerem." Rashi has "*when* I spoke" (as also has R.V. marg.). R.V. text has "I believe, *for* I will speak." These facts suggest that the writer may be alluding to the quotation, not as being in the LXX, but as being *in an interpretation of the Psalm—one among many interpretations—familiar to Christians through the second Epistle to the Corinthians,* as though the writer said to himself, "The Apostle says that he believed *and therefore he burst forth into speaking*; but 'speaking' must be under the control of the Holy Spirit which must rest on the speaker; so that one might also say 'I believed *and therefore I attained rest*[1]'."

It may be argued that a Christian poet, writing in Hebrew, would not be likely to follow Paul in misquoting Hebrew Scripture. But he is not "misquoting"; he is alluding and deliberately varying. We must try to understand the Jewish traditions about "believing" and "resting." They are worth noting here as they bear on other passages in the Odes which connect "belief" with "a song-of-glorifying," and in which we find, latent or expressed, the thought of crossing "great rivers" or passing along a "way" that is "levelled" for "believers" by the Lord—in other words, allusion to the crossing of the Red Sea and the Jordan[2]. The two acts of "crossing" were emblematic of a typical "entering into rest,"

[1] For an allusion in Ode vi. 17 to a phrase used in 1 Thess. v. 12 see *Light on the Gospel* **3747** *h.*

[2] Comp. Ode xvi. 5 "I am strong in His song-of-glorifying, and there is to-me *belief* in Him" with xli. 1 "A song-of-glorifying to the Lord [will be uttered by] all His offspring, and they will (?) pour-out-to-the-utmost (*or*, collect) the truth of His *belief*." Also comp. xxii. 7 "Thy hand hath levelled the way for them that *are-believing* in thee" with xxxix. 4—11 "those who cross them [*i.e.* great rivers] in *belief* are not shaken...and a way has been appointed...for those who agree with (Harnack, *zustimmen*) the Way of His *belief*."

partially accomplished by Moses, but completely by Joshua (the first Jesus).

The Epistle to the Hebrews, after quoting—from the Psalms—"that they should not *enter into his rest*," says "We see that *they were not able to 'enter in' because of unbelief*." Substitute "*I*" for "*they*," and take away the negatives, and we have exactly our Poet's thought:—"*I was able to enter in because of belief*," or "*I believed, therefore I attained-rest*[1]." Many thoughts like these are collected in the early commentary called Mechiltha on the words that precede the Song of the Red Sea:—"And Israel saw...and they believed in the Lord and in his servant Moses. Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord[2]." The Hebrew "believe" means radically "make firm," "make stedfast," and the commentary collects instances where this connection is indicated, as in Chronicles, "*Believe* (i.e. make strong) and ye shall be *believable* (i.e. *made-strong*, R.V. *established*[3])." There is the same play in the Ode here: "I *believed*; therefore (*lit.* because of that), I *attained-rest*: because *believable* is he in whom *I have believed*." This "belief" implies stability, or "*rest*"; and Mechiltha says that, as a reward for "*belief*," Abraham "inherited this world and the world to come," and "the Holy Spirit *rested* on Israel and they sang unto the Lord."

These thoughts appear to me to have been in the Poet's mind, when he wrote the words under discussion, "I believed, therefore I attained-rest." He was not thinking merely of the perplexing and disputed passage in the Psalm above quoted, nor merely of Paul's quotation of it, but partly also of those

[1] See Heb. iii. 11—iv. 10, which deals with "*rest*" and "*unbelief*." Note, too, the Christian allusion to the first "Jesus" in iv. 8 "For if *Jesus* [*i.e.* Joshua] had given them *rest*."

[2] Exod. xiv. 31—xv. 1.

[3] 2 Chr. xx. 20. R.V. finds the same play in Is. vii. 9 "If ye will not *believe*, surely ye shall not be *established*."

deep consequences of "belief" which were suggested by the Jewish traditions concerning the belief of Abraham before the birth of Isaac, and the belief of Israel at the Red Sea. "Israel burst out into song," the Poet might say, "Yes, but what followed? The Psalmist says, '*Then believed they his words, they sang his praise, they soon forgat his works*[1].' Let me rather think of Abraham, who '*believed*,' but did not '*forget*,' and who, as a reward, entered into the rest of Paradise, '*I believed, therefore also I entered-into-rest*[2]'."

It may be objected that this is far-fetched: "The Poet ought not to be supposed to have been *consciously* thinking of the Jewish traditions concerning the belief of Abraham. He was expressing his own inner experience, though naturally reminiscences of tradition &c. might accompany the sense of his own experience. To suppose more than this is to suppose what is not natural." My reply would be: "True, it *is* not 'natural' for *us now*. But it *was* 'natural' *then* for a poet in the first century, who not only called himself a son of Abraham but also still, even in the light of the Messiah, looked back on Abraham as the Rock of the Old Church, and as the first of the Fathers through whose name God revealed Himself to mankind, calling Himself 'the God of Abraham[3]'."

§ 5. "*Unto thee have I fled, my God*[4]"

It is alleged by Dom Connolly that the Hebrew words for "flee," and their Syriac equivalent, the word here used, are not, so far as he knows, "used metaphorically of fleeing for refuge to, taking refuge in, God; they regularly denote a real

[1] Ps. cvi. 12—13.

[2] If it were asserted that, in this world, Abraham did *not* "enter into rest," the spiritual Jew would certainly deny this, as he does in *Mechiltha*. See *Light on the Gospel* **3867** "he was at home with God," even when wandering in Palestine.

[3] Gen. xxvi. 24.

[4] Ode xxv. 1.

local flight"; and he therefore asks "Is not this a translation of *πρὸς σὲ κατέφυγον* (cf. Ps. cxlii 9)[1]?"

But the Syriac word is used in the Hexapla as a rendering of "Many nations shall *flee* (*καταφεύξονται*) *unto the Lord*[2]." It does not mean merely "flee," but "flee-away," and is appropriately used of "fleeing-away" from the prison of a cruel Master to the House of Freedom[3].

On the supposition that the Odist is quoting from the Psalm, we have to remember that the Hebrew "*I have hidden*" is quite exceptionally used with "unto thee." The Targum paraphrases the clause; the Syriac omits it. The LXX *κατέφυγον* indicates that they read כסתי as נסתי "I *fled*." The root of the latter (נוס) is given by Trommius as meaning *φεύγω* 119 times and *καταφεύγω* 7 times[4]. If this is accepted, then the Hebrew *does here exceptionally use flee* "*metaphorically of fleeing for refuge to, taking refuge in, God*," and Dom Connolly's objection falls to the ground[5].

---

[1] Ps. cxliii. 9, R.V. txt "I flee unto thee to hide me," marg. "*Heb.* Unto thee have I hidden." Walton's Syriac omits the clause.

[2] Zech. ii. 15 (11).

[3] The Heb. (Gesen. 530—1) is simply used of strangers "attaching themselves" to the Lord in Is. lvi. 3, Zech. ii. 15, Jerem. l. 5. The Syriac word used in the Ode, and in Zech. Hexapl., pulls out the notion of *deserting* from heathendom. See *Thes.* 2997 quoting "ethnicos mores *aufugiemus*," Jo. Eph. ccxxiv. 19.

[4] This reading is preferable to חסה "seek refuge." Gesen. 492 *a* says "כְּסִתִי...is error for חָסִיתִי acc. to LXX *κατέφυγον* SS." It adds "but חסה not constr. wi. אֶל־." It might have added "and חסה is never rendered *φεύγω* or *καταφεύγω*."

[5] Comp. Prov. xviii. 10 "The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous *runneth into it* and is safe." To me there seems much condensed beauty in the Masoretic reading "I hid unto thee," but translators would naturally paraphrase it.

§ 6. "*Why is the Greek word for harp always used in the Syriac version of the Odes?*"

This question is asked by Dom Connolly in order to suggest the answer, "Because the Odes were written in Greek." But the facts do not suggest that answer, if we do not bind ourselves to a hypothesis that the Odist adhered to some rule about the rendering of the two Hebrew words for stringed instruments, *nebhel* and *kinnōr*, in the Syriac version of the Psalms, a rule that varies according as the two words stand singly, or, as often, coupled[1]. The Odist never couples such words. He uses but one word for harp, and this four times, namely, a Syriac transliteration of the Greek κιθάρα.

This Syriac *kithra* is found in eight instances (or practically five) in O.T.[2] In the first instance it represents the Heb. *kinnōr*, occurring in the passage describing Jubal's invention of the "*harp*" and "pipe[3]." There it seems to represent stringed instruments as "pipe" represents wind instruments. In Samuel, mentioning "*psaltery* (*nebhel*), timbrel (*tōph*), pipe, and harp (*kinnōr*)," Syr. has *kithra* for *nebhel*[4]. So it has in the next instance, "Rejoice in the Lord, O ye righteous....Give thanks unto the Lord with the harp: sing praises unto him with

[1] It may be added that Aquila and the rest differ both from the LXX and from one another in their renderings of these words. Trommius gives *nebhel* (in the musical sense) as κιθάρα (1), νάβλη (13), ναύλη (1), νέβελ (2), ὄργανον (2), ψαλμός (1), ψαλτήριον (7). In Ben Sira xxxix. 15 (? corrupt) "songs of nebhel and instruments of strings (?)," LXX has ἐν ᾠδαῖς χειλέων καὶ ἐν κινύραις, Syr. "cum laudibus, gratiarum actione, et elata voce," in *ib.* xl. 21 "nebhel," LXX has ψαλτήριον, Syr. *epōdos* from the Greek ἐπῳδός (*Thes.* 331).

[2] *Thes.* gives Gen. iv. 21, 1 S. x. 5, Ps. xxxiii. 2, lxxxi. 2, Dan. iii. 5, 7. Walton gives it also in Dan. iii. 10, 15. Dan. iii. 5—15 contains *verbatim* repetitions, so as to be practically one passage.

[3] Gen. iv. 21. The Pesh. Syr. renders "pipe" by *kinnōr*, either misrendering the text, or having a different text.

[4] 1 S. x. 5. Syr. also has *kinnōr* to represent *tōph*, "timbrel."

the *psaltery* (*nebhel*) of ten strings[1]," and in the next, "Take ye up the psalm, and give [forth the sound of] the timbrel, the pleasant harp (*kinnōr*) with the *psaltery* (*nebhel*)[2]." On this passage, the Midrash on *Tehillim* quotes a tradition of R. Asi, quoted by Rashi as from R. Simeon: "Why is it called *nebhel*? Because it *makes-foolish* (i.e. *stultifies*, or *puts to shame*, a form of *nbl*) all [other] kinds of music." Rashi quotes this in a context that indicates a belief that the *nebhel* represented a fuller and grander music than that of the *kinnōr*. In both of these Psalms, the music is not that of an individual worshipper, but that of the nation. They are songs of Israel full of allusions to the Exodus and to the passage of the Red Sea—latent for Gentiles but manifest to the most degenerate Jew[3].

I can see no reason why the author of the Odes should not have used the Hebrew *nebhel* and the Syriac translator rendered it as *kithra*. The Thesaurus (3613) gives a picture of this *kithra* as an instrument with ten strings, and this suits the general thought of the Odes, though we must not suppose that the Odist alludes to it literally when he speaks of "a harp of many voices[4]."

---

[1] Ps. xxxiii. 1—2. A.V. "the psaltery [and] an instrument of ten strings."

[2] Ps. lxxxi. 2.

[3] Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 7 "He gathereth the waters of the sea as an *heap*" (on which see Rashi) with Exod. xv. 8 "as an *heap*," and Ps. xxxiii. 17 "a *horse* is a vain thing" with Exod. xv. 1 "the *horse* and his rider" (on which see *Light on the Gospel* **3795** *a*). Also note the reference to the Exodus in Ps. lxxxi. 5 "He appointed it in Joseph for a testimony when he went out over the land of Egypt." See Philo (i. 374—5) who after quoting Exod. xv. 1 "the horse and his rider," enters into the allegory of the "lyre" as denoting the harmony of the righteous soul. And Clement of Alexandria (784) says that "the people that is in the act of being saved" may be called a "harp," when "under the inspiration (ἐπίπνοιαν) of the Word and the recognition of God, it glorifies [God]."

[4] See *Light on the Gospel* **3792** *c*. I have said little about the transliteration of κιθάρα in the Aramaic of Daniel iii. 5—15 because Levy gives

§ 7. "*Alleged translation from Greek words with privative alpha*"

(*a*) The first of these is Ode xii. 5 "for the swiftness of the Word is *indescribable*," lit. "without recounting." This Dom Connolly identifies with ἀνεκδιήγητος. But the Syriac for "without" is really a form of the negative preceded by the relative ("that not"), a form also frequent in New Hebrew. The Syriac may sometimes be used, as will be seen below, to express a Hebrew original like Ps. cxlvii. 5 "To His [*i.e.* God's] understanding *there-is-not number*"—though in that particular passage the Syriac follows the Hebrew. The instances of "*there-was-not* (or, *there-is-not*) *number*" are very frequent in Hebrew. In very few of these does the LXX use ἀναρίθμητος[1]. So frequent is the Hebraic phrase "there is no number" that in the present passage we may regard it as pointing to a Hebrew, as against a Greek, original. And if it should be urged that "*number*" is not the same thing as "*recounting*," we may reply that the Hebrew verb whence "number" is derived means "count," "recount," "relate," and that the noun itself is recognised by Gesenius as capable of meaning "*recounting*," or "*relation*[2]."

---

no reason to suppose that it could be used in Hebrew. Nor is there space to discuss Joseph. *Ant.* vii. 12. 3 ἡ μὲν κινύρα δέκα χορδαῖς ἐξημμένη τύπτεται πλήκτρῳ, ἡ δὲ νάβλα δώδεκα φθόγγους ἔχουσα τοῖς δακτύλοις κρούεται. Is there any difference between χορδαί and φθόγγοι? The Psalms speak of "ten strings," where does Josephus find "twelve"? "Twelve strings" would favour Clement's view that the "lyre" meant the "twelve" tribes of Israel, the whole harmonious "people (λαός)." But I have found no such allusion.

[1] This may be seen by comparing the numerous instances of "no number" in Gesen. 708—9 with ἀναρίθμητος and ἀριθμός in the LXX Concordance. Sometimes the Heb. is preceded by "until" or "to," *e.g.* 1 Chr. xxii. 4 "and cedar trees *to* there was no number," καὶ ξύλα κέδρινα, οὐκ ἦν ἀριθμός, where the LXX makes no attempt to render the preposition.

[2] Gesen. 707—9, quoting Judg. vii. 15 R.V. "telling," but Gesen. "recounting," where the LXX has ἐξήγησιν, Luc. διήγησιν. This resembles ἀνεκδιήγητος, when stripped of its negative. On Ps. xix. 1 "the

Note the following instances of the Hebrew "there-is-not":—Deut. xxxii. 4 "a God of faithfulness *and there-is-not iniquity*," LXX *καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία*, with *v.r.* additional *ἐν αὐτῷ*, Syr. *et non est* iniquus; Jerem. v. 21 "hear ye this, people foolish and (lit.) *there-is-no heart*," LXX *ἀκάρδιος*, Targ. and Syr. as Heb., but *Syr. substitutes the relative for "and"*; Ps. civ. 25 "creeping things *and there-is-no number*," LXX *ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός*, Targ. as Heb., but Syr., *without* *ἔστιν*, "*that-not*"—*the form* ("*dlâ*") *being the same as in Ode* xii. 5; Exod. xxi. 11 "she shall go out free *there-is-no money*," LXX *ἄνευ ἀργυρίου*, Onk. "*with-not* money," Jer. Targ. and Syr. "*that-not* money"; Jerem. ii. 32 "days *there-is-no number*," LXX *ὧν οὐκ ἔστιν ἀριθμός*, Targ. *dlâ'*, but Syr. rel. ("*d*") with negative verb; Hos. iii. 4 (rep. five times) "The children of Israel shall abide many days, *there-is-no* prince, and *there-is-no* sacrifice..." LXX rep. *οὐκ ὄντος*, Targ. as Heb., but Syr. *dlâ'* ("*that-not*") as in Ode xii. 5.

These facts shew that the Syriac *dlâ'*, though it may often represent the Greek privative *alpha* in later Syriac literature, cannot be relied on as representing *alpha* in any earlier literature that may reasonably be supposed to be affected by the Hebrew Bible. The weight of the Greek *alpha* is altogether overbalanced by the weight of the Hebrew "*there-is-not.*"

Nor does the case for the Hebrew stop here. Less than half of it has been represented. Gesenius (pp. 519—20)[1]

heavens are *recounting* the glory of God," LXX *διηγοῦνται*, the Midrash (Wü. p. 171) implies that it *cannot* be "recounted," quoting Ps. lxv. 1 in the form "To thee silence is praise." Comp. Ps. lxxi. 15 "My mouth shall recount thy righteousness...for I *know not the recountings*," i.e. the numbers thereof (Gesen. 708 *b*).

[1] See also Gesen. p. 115 for instances of a preposition connected with *bal*, "not," and with the thought of defect or failure, as in Ps. lxiii. 1 "a dry land *without* water." This word is accountable (Trommius, Heb. Index, p. 19) for the *alpha* privative in *ἀγνωσία* (1), *ἀκουσίως* (1), *ἀδίκως* (1), *ἄνυδρος* (1). In such cases, a detachable Syriac negative is naturally to be explained as from Hebrew, not from Greek.

gives a multitude of instances where the Hebrew "not"—either as "*lo'*" or as *blo'* ("in-not" or "with-not")—is represented in phrases that have gone far beyond the limits of the Greek *alpha*, e.g. "they made me jealous with *a not-God*," "with *a not-people*," "rejoice in a *not-thing*" (i.e. a thing of naught), "a morning *not-clouds*" (i.e. cloudless), "a waste *not-path*" (i.e. pathless). In these cases LXX seldom has *alpha* privative and often has a confused rendering. The Hebrew use is especially frequent when the negative is preceded by the preposition meaning "in" or "with," "*in-not* righteousness," "*in-not* justice," "*with-not* price," *i.e.* gratuitously.

(*b*) Dom Connolly lays special stress on the phrase "*without* (lit. *that-not*) grudging" in Ode xi. 6 translated by Dr Harris (in the Introduction to his second edition, p. 47) "Speaking waters touched my lips from the fountain of God *without grudging* (i.e. *abundantly*)[1]." Here, and in Ode vii. 3 "He caused me to know Himself *without grudging*," and xx. 7 "Put on the grace of the Lord *without grudging*," Dom Connolly maintains that the Syriac is "quite inadequate to express 'liberally,' 'freely,'" *which he infers to be the real meaning* "from the requirements of the context and from the literal correspondence of the Syriac phrase to *ἀφθόνως*." The Syriac expression, he adds, "is found as a translation of *ἄφθονος*, *ἀφθόνως*, in 4 Macc. iii. 10 (*ἀφθόνους πηγάς*), and Wisd. vii. 13; and the crudeness of the Syriac in the former case is paralleled by the passages in the Odes."

This argument appears to ignore the following facts. (1) In special contexts, the Greek *ἄφθονος*, applied to things, may mean "without grudging." (2) There is probably such a special context in Wisdom, but not in Maccabees. (3) Philo, as has been pointed out above, uses *ἄφθονος* with allusion to sayings of Plato about God's freedom from envy.

[1] Dr Harris has "plenteously" in his text of the second edition (p. 105), which also has (correctly) "fountain of the Lord" (not "fountain of God").

(4) Philo, in connection with the Tree of Life mentioned in Gen. iii. 22 "And now lest he [*i.e.* man] put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever," defends God from the charge of "*envy*" or "*grudging*." (5) In Wisd. vii. 13 "I learned without guile and impart her [*i.e.* Wisdom] *without grudging* (ἀφθόνως)," the English version, while giving in its text "*liberally*," has in its margin, "or, *without envy*, as in ch. vi. 23." The reference is to "I will bring the knowledge of her [*i.e.* of Wisdom] into light, and will not pass by the truth, neither will I go along with wasting *envy*." (6) Irenaeus, replying to the question "Was not God able to bring forth Man from the beginning perfect?" says that He bestows what is good "*ungrudgingly*[1]." (7) Tertullian—apparently following the thought noted above in Philo—describes the devil, in connection with the prohibition to eat of the Tree, as representing that God "*envied* men the property of divinity[2]." (8) Clement of Alexandria contrasts the Lord, whom "*envy* does not touch," with "another," whom he describes as "*the envier*," in allusion to God and the devil, and to the eating of the tree[3].

These facts should be combined with those in the Odes where "*no grudging*," or "*no envying*," is connected with "*knowing the Lord*," with "*the speaking water from the fountain of the Lord*," with "putting on [oneself] the grace of the Lord...and coming into Paradise, and making a crown from His tree," and with "*the knowledge* of the Most High." Thus combined, they seem to me to go beyond indication and to approach demonstration. For the conclusion as to *thought*, in this paragraph, must be distinguished from the conclusion as to *word*, *i.e.* the verbal origin, whether Greek or

[1] Iren. iv. 38. 1—3.

[2] *Adv. Marcion.* ii. 10.

[3] See Clem. Alex. 832, on which see Mayor quoting Theoph. *Aut.* ii. 25 "not as though *grudging* (φθονῶν)—as some suppose—did God command him not to eat of knowledge."

Hebrew, of the Syriac negations above enumerated. As to the latter, the verbal question, I do not assert that Hebrew origin is proved, but I do venture to assert that Greek origin is not proved nor even made probable. As to the former—the thought—no doubt whatever is left on my mind that the Poet is not thinking of an "*abundant*" or "*plentiful*" fruit of knowledge, or water of knowledge. Like Philo and the author of Wisdom, and the early Christian Fathers—and like Plato too—he is exulting in the revelation that the All-sufficing Father not only gives but also gives "*without grudging*."

§ 8. *The use of the Syriac relative after substantives to express possession*

(*a*) It is alleged that "in original compositions by the best Syriac writers," a suffix would suffice to represent possession, *e.g.* "my-right-hand" in one word. But the Odes have, in at least one passage[1], "the right-hand *that-is-to-me*." This is a form that "should not be used (in cases where a possessive suffix is grammatically possible) except to give some sort of prominence to the possessor or to emphasize the fact of possession."

(*b*) It is alleged that "there is no obvious reason for emphasis—'my own'—here." This "indiscriminate employment after a noun, and equivalent to μου, αὐτοῦ, in the same position, is frequent in translations from Greek (though not in the earliest) but is hardly met with in native Syriac works."

(*c*) It is then alleged that this usage in the Odes cannot be explained from Hebrew: "I cannot think that a Syriac translation from Hebrew of, say, the third or fourth century, would have contained these anomalous constructions; for Hebrew has no detachable possessive particle and relies entirely upon suffixes."

(*d*) Eight examples of this "unidiomatic use" in the Odes are given by Dom Connolly.

[1] Ode viii. 21.

(*a*) First, as to the style of the Odes, no one, I think, maintains—certainly I do not—that their Syriac resembles that of "original compositions by the best Syriac writers." My view—which I hold subject to correction from further evidence—is that it is early Syriac of an uncouth and rudimentary character, and not an "original composition" in Syriac, but translated from Hebrew. The language of the Syriac Odes appears to me to present more resemblance to the pre-literary Syriac Versions of O.T. than to the literary Syriac so copiously represented in the Thesaurus.

(*b*) Secondly, as to "no obvious emphasis" in the particular passage quoted above, I should be disposed to say that the emphasis is as obvious and as characteristic as in many passages of the Fourth Gospel where Jesus speaks of "my sheep," "my peace," "my love," "my kingdom[1]." The context breathes of God's Fatherly appropriation of men as His own :—

"For I do not turn my face from *my own*. Because I know them, and before they came into being I observed them (*or*, reviewed them) and their faces [too]. [Yea] I (*emph.*) sealed them (*emph.*). I (*emph.*) framed their members, and *my own* breasts did I prepare for them, that they might drink *my own* holy milk, that they might live thereby. I was well pleased in them, and am not ashamed of them. For *my own* work are they and the strength of my designs. Who therefore will rise up against my work, or who will there be that is not compliant with them? [It was] I [that] willed by my good pleasure and [thereby] formed and fashioned the understanding and the heart ; and they are verily *my own* ; and *on my own right hand* have I set my elect[2]."

[1] Jn x. 26, xiv. 27, xv. 9, xviii. 36. In O.T. comp. Cant. i. 6 "*Mine own* vineyard," better rendered in viii. 12 "*Mine own* vineyard, [the vineyard] *that is mine*." It is appropriate in Songs of Solomon.

[2] Ode viii. 15—21, as translated in *Light on the Gospel* 3797—817.

(*c*) In the next place, the statement that "Hebrew has no detachable possessive particle and relies entirely upon suffixes," though true, is liable to mislead if it causes us to ignore the influence likely to be exerted on translations from Hebrew by the Hebrew use of the relative with the dative pronoun to denote possession. The Hebrew "qui [erat *or* est]" with dative ("*'asher-l'*") is represented in New Hebrew by *shel*, which corresponds in some respects to the Aramaic and Syriac forms in which the relative *d* corresponds to the relative *sh*. The full Hebrew phrase is very widely used. The instances given by Gesenius under the heading of the Hebrew dativa1 preposition all refer to sacred things appropriated to Jehovah, or to Aaron His priest, or to His altar, or to Jehovah's people for whom a sacrifice is to be offered[1]. Hence it might well be used in Hebrew Songs to express

"*My own* right hand" appears to me to mean "*my own* right hand which is not like that of an earthly king." Somewhat similarly a distinction of royalty is indicated by this construction of the relative in Hebrew, Targum, and Syriac, but not in LXX, in the instructions given by David for the coronation of Solomon (1 K. i. 33) "Set him upon the mule *that is mine* (lit. *that is to me*)." Here the LXX has (as one might expect) the reduplicated article, not the relative. But the Syriac follows the Hebrew, as also does the Targum, only substituting for the Heb. *'asher-l* respectively the Syriac and Aramaic equivalents.

[1] See Gesen. 513 *b* referring to Exod. xxix. 29, xxxix. 1, 39, Lev. vii. 20, 21, xvi. 6, 15. In these cases, however, the ordinary possessive suffix could not be used, so that the relative phrase was necessary. For others see Gesen. 83 *a*, noting the correspondence of the Biblical *'asher-l* to *shel* which is "in habitual use" in New Hebrew, "as a mark of the genitive."

Schlatter, on Jn i. 41, τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον, calls attention to the emphatic use of *shel* ("*his own* son and not another's") in *Mechilt.* (Wü. p. 277, on Exod. xxi. 31 (Schl. by error xxi. 28)). In *Aboth* (ii. 2) "Rabban Gamliel (lit.) his son [*the son*] *that* [*belongs*] *to* R. Jehudah ha-Nasi" is perhaps unique (instead of the usual *ben* followed by the name of the father). Has it anything to do with the fact that R. Jehudah (Taylor) "is said (*Kethuboth* 103 *b*)" to have nominated *his own* son to succeed him as Nasi? See below (§ 12) for further details on *shel*, also Gesen. 979 on the relative *sh-*, as being probably not an abbreviation but "an original demonstrative particle," but "in usage, limited to late Hebrew" (not used in the Prophets, exc. Jonah and Lamentations).

divine appropriation or possession as above mentioned, and, if so used in Hebrew, it would naturally be retained in an early literal Syriac translation[1]. *Shel*, with various suffixes, occurs no less than thrice (*e.g. shellî*, "quod [est] mihi") in the short Song of Solomon, and probably once in the Song of Jacob[2]. There is also an instance elsewhere of *shel* with 1st pers. pl. suffix, meaning "[eorum] qui [sunt] nobis[3]." It is true that the use of *shel* in Solomon's Song is not an exact parallel. For it supplements, and is not a substitute for, the possessive suffix. Nevertheless it may prepare us for finding in a first-century Hebrew original of the Odes of Solomon somewhat strange combinations of Old and New Hebrew with Aramaic idiom. But in any case the evidence of the LXX, so far as it goes, points to the conclusion that in the Syriac version, the use of the detachable possessive particle would be in accordance with a development of Hebrew precedent, and not derivable from anything correspondent in Greek[4].

(*d*) I pass to Dom Connolly's eight instances of the unidiomatic expression.

(i) Ode viii. 21 "and at my right hand." This has been shewn above to mean "my own right hand," and therefore to be in accordance with Syriac idiom.

[1] Besides 1 K. i. 33 quoted above, note 2 K. xvi. 13 "the peace offerings that were his own," *i.e.* his own idolatrous invention, where the Targ. and the Syr. follow the Hebrew, but the LXX has the reduplicated article. So, too, in Cant. i. 6, viii. 12 "my vineyard, *that which is mine*" (where the Hebrew has the shorter form *shel*) the Syr. also has the relative and dative, but the LXX has (1) ἐμός, (2) μου ἐμός.

[2] Cant. i. 6, iii. 7, viii. 12, Gen. xlix. 10 (on which see p. 95).

[3] 2 K. vi. 11 "Who of [those] that [belong] to us [is] on-the-side-of (*lit.* toward) the king of Israel?" (Gesen. 513 *b*).

[4] Gesen. 980 *a*, comparing Heb. *shel* with the corresponding Syriac, quotes Lk. vi. 42 "*my* words," as having the emphatic possessive "my words that are to me." This must be an error for Lk. ix. 26. But there Walton gives only the ordinary suffix, and Burkitt gives "ashamed of me, before men, and of *them that are mine*." In the parall. Mk viii. 38 Burkitt gives the ordinary suffix. In Jn x. 26, xiv. 27 &c. SS has the detachable suffix, but omits it in other places where the emphasis would justify it.

(ii) Ode xi. 18 "in thy land." The right rendering is "in *the land that is thine own*." There is a contrast, throughout the Ode, between "the folly that is diffused *over the earth*," man's abode, and the fruitfulness of the abode prepared above by God, God's *own* abode, or "Paradise"—called "*thy* Paradise," "*His* Paradise." This contrast finds expression here. It is said of the evil and corrupt, "They have changed *from darkness into light...from wickedness to the pleasantness that is thine own;* and they turned away the bitterness of the trees from themselves as soon as they were planted in *the land that is thine own*[1]."

(iii) Ode xii. 4 "of thy beauty." "Thy" is an error for "his," and Dr Harris's rendering "His own beauty" appears to me to express the Poet's emphasis on the contrast between the beauty above and the beauty below, and also the feeling that all true beauty comes as God's "own" gift.

(iv) and (v) Ode xvii. 12—13 "in my love" and "my blessing." The Messiah is here speaking describing Himself as "the door of everything," and as going to "loose" the "bondmen" whom He calls "His" ("my bondmen"). In such a context, both of the alleged phrases appear to be parallel in their emphasis to Johannine emphatic phrases, such as "the peace that is mine" and "the love that is mine," which might be rendered by the emphatic Syriac form in question[2]. Ought not these parallelisms to lead us to reflect that perhaps the same reason that makes the emphatic ἐμός

[1] In Jn xvii. 17 "*thy word* (ὁ λόγος ὁ σός) is truth," Syr. Walton (but not SS) has "thy word [the word] that [is] thine."

[2] Jn xiv. 27 εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμήν, SS and Walton "peace [the peace] that [is] mine." So Jn xviii. 36 (Walton) "my kingdom [the one] that [is] mine" (SS missing). But in Jn xv. 9 (Walton) "my love [the love] that [is] mine," SS has "my love." Jn uses ἐμός in these passages with the article. But it is without the article in Jn iv. 34 ἐμὸν βρῶμα, where SS and Walton have "my food [the food] that [is] mine." Ἐμός occurs but twice in the whole of the Epistle to the Romans, whereas it occurs thrice in the brief Epistle to Philemon.

so frequent in John, who uses it nearly four times as often as all the Synoptists taken together, may also make the emphatic possessives frequent in the Odes? The Odes, like the Fourth Gospel, are pervaded with the thought of personality—the close personal relations between Man and his Redeemer. The Lord is regarded as saying to those whom He has redeemed "Ye are *my own*," and each redeemed soul as echoing back to the Redeemer "*my own*—yes, thou, too, art my own[1]."

(vi) Ode xxv. 2 "and my helper." The context appears to justify us in finding emphasis here: "I was rescued from my bonds and unto thee, O God, did I flee; for thou art the right hand of my Salvation and *the Helper* (lit.) *that is mine own*," i.e. the Helper that will never desert me, but will be mine for ever. It has been pointed out above[2] that the words may imply that the redeemed soul is closely united with the Redeemer.

(vii) Ode xxvi. 2 "His holy song." The context implies that the mouth of the Poet can sing the song that belongs to God because the Poet himself is God's: "I poured out praise unto the Lord, *because I am His own*, and I will speak the holy psalm *that is His* because my *heart is toward Him*." Moreover the passage resembles passages like those that speak of "*the holy garments of Aaron*," where Hebrew, Targum, LXX and Syriac, might all naturally have the relative[3]. Either of these causes would suffice to defend the relative here on the supposition that the passage is translated from Hebrew.

(viii) Ode xxviii. 9 "but my [suffering of] wrong." This instance differs from all the rest and admits perhaps of

[1] Compare the first verse of the first Ode, "The Lord is on my head like a crown, nor shall I be apart from Him," with the last of the last Ode, "They are free men, and they are mine."

[2] See § 5 above.

[3] Comp. Exod. xxix. 29 where all have the relative, see above, p. 69, n. 1.

a different explanation. The Thesaurus alleges no instance where the word is used with a genitive or possessive suffix, but gives the impression that "*my wrong*," *if expressed by the mere possessive suffix*, would mean "*my wrong-doing*" (like *ἀδικία μου* in Greek)[1]. For this reason the Poet may write exceptionally "the wrong that [is] to me," meaning "the wrong done to me[2]."

These instances do not necessarily point to a New Hebrew original, although the Syriac idiom is more like New Hebrew than Greek; but on the other hand they do not indicate that the original was Greek. Other instances may perhaps be alleged in future studies of the Odes proving Dom Connolly's conclusion. But these, in my opinion, do not prove it[3].

§ 9. "*Until it was given in the midst*[4]"

Dom Connolly argues that these words "could not be a translation from Hebrew, since they contain an unsemitic

[1] See *Thes.* 1478. It gives a feminine form of the word, with a 3rd pers. pl. possess. suffix, as meaning "eorum fraudes," *i.e.* the wrongs they had *done*.

[2] For a similar Hebrew use of *shel* to denote the objective genitive, see *Jebam.* xi. 7 (Mishna) (lit.) "For *his-striking* and for *his-cursing that* [*belongs*] *to* (*shel*) this [man] and *that* [*belongs*] *to* that [man]," meaning "For striking and for cursing this man or that." The "his" refers not to the striker but to the stricken (see *Jewish Qu. Rev.* July 1908, p. 728).

[3] I have confined myself to Dom Connolly's instances, and am far from asserting that all the detachable possessives in the Odes can be explained on the ground of emphasis. But many can, that do not at first seem emphatic, *e.g.* Ode xvii. 13 "and I sowed *my fruits* in hearts, and transformed them in myself"—(see *Light on the Gospel* **3874** *b*)—"and they received *the blessing that is mine* and lived." Here it may be said that there is no more emphasis on "*my* blessing" than on "*my* fruits." I differ. There appears to me to be climax as regards emphasis on personality. In the first clause there is some emphasis on "fruits," which (*Light* **3874** *b*) means "my *fruitful seed*." The meaning is "I first sowed my fruitful seed in hearts. Thus I transformed them—in myself—into my own nature. And thus they received *the blessing that belongs to my nature*, and passed into life eternal."

[4] Ode xxx. 6.

idiom, viz., *εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι, in medio ponere*," and he adds "Dr Abbott adduces from Numb. xxx. 5 the phrase 'in the middle'; but there a real local 'middle,' of a carefully specified area, is in question[1]." But besides Numb. xxxv. 5, there are other instances of the Hebrew "*in the midst*" (which corresponds to the Syriac[2]) used absolutely, in such a way as to indicate that it could be employed in New Hebrew absolutely, in a context where a locality is not expressed but only implied[3]. Now the Ode does imply locality. It begins with the words "Fill ye waters for yourselves from the living fountain of the Lord...and come...and rest by the fountain of the Lord...it gives rest to the soul." Now "rest," in the Odes, implies Paradise—that place of beauty and fruitfulness about which it is said in Revelation that "*in the midst* of the open-place thereof (*πλατείας*)...there was a river of water of life[4]." Unfortunately the text in Isaiah about idolaters, and "gardens," and "*in the midst*," is disputed; but in any case it is an instance of the absolute use of "*in the midst*[5]." Rashi takes it as meaning "*in the midst* of the garden," and Ibn Ezra either thus or as "*in the midst* of the idolaters." Either interpretation would, by antithesis, illustrate the present passage. In New Hebrew, this word for "midst" may mean "the inner" as distinct from "the outer" nature[6], so that there may also be an undercurrent of meaning. Not only is the

[1] *Journ. Theol. Stud.* p. 531. I adduced Numb. xxxv. 5 (not xxx. 5).

[2] The Syriac word is derived from *μέσος*, which also exists as a form of New Hebrew as well as Aramaic.

[3] "*In the midst*" is used absolutely in Gen. xv. 10, Numb. xxxv. 5, Josh. viii. 22 (*lit.* "to Israel *in the midst*"), Judg. xv. 4, Is. lxvi. 17. Of these, only Numb. xxxv. 5 and Is. lxvi. 17 point to locality. But they are sufficient to shew that the absolute use of the phrase in New Hebrew must have been very early. Delitzsch uses it absolutely in Mt. xiv. 6, Mk iii. 3, Mk xiv. 60, Lk. vi. 8, for *ἐν τῷ μέσῳ* and *εἰς τὸ μέσον* and *εἰς μέσον*.

[4] Rev. xxii. 1—2. For the connection between "*rest*" and "*Paradise*" in the Odes, see *Light on the Gospel* **3847—83**, and especially **3859—64**.

[5] Is. lxvi. 17.

[6] Levy iv. 631 *b*, 641 *b*, and i. 256 *b*.

"fountain" set as God's gift, "in the midst[1]" of Paradise so that it flows forth to all therein, but it also flows "undefined and unseen," like the Spirit in the "heart," "midst," or "inward" man—so that "until it was given *in the midst* [of the heart] they did not know it[2]."

This is perhaps too subtle. But an interpretation without any play on words and simply taking "in the midst" to mean "in the midst of Paradise," seems to me far more likely than one that bases itself on an original εἰς τὸ μέσον τιθέναι of which the usual meaning would be "set a prize before all, for all to contest," "propose," "bring forward in public," "make a public contribution." And the use of "give" for "*ponere*" would in itself favour Hebraic origin.

§ 10. "*He was known from before the* (*lit.*) *casting-down of the aeon*"

I pass to a tenth instance, previously alleged by Dom Connolly from Ode xli. 16, which he renders "*from before the constitution of the world*[3]." The words are, he assumes, a Syriac translation of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου used by the Odist writing in Greek. Καταβολὴ κόσμου occurs ten times in N.T. In seven out of ten cases the Peshitta renders it by the phrase used in the Ode here, "*the casting-down of the aeon.*" It is not a phrase used in Hebrew. Hebrew prefers "*founding*, or *establishing*, or *creating*, the earth, or the habitable-world." Nor is the phrase used by *Syr. vet.* "Syriac," we are told, "has other words, corresponding to the Hebrew ones, to express

[1] Comp. Jerem. xxxi. 33 "I will give [*i.e.* set as a gift] my law in their inward parts," where the LXX also has "give," but the Syr. has not.

[2] See *Son of Man* **3362** (i) *a—c* for ambiguities and plays of words on "*midst*," and comp. Origen (*Comm.* Joann. vi. 15 on Jn i. 26) "there standeth one *in the midst of* you whom ye know not," that is, "*invisible* in His divine nature (ἀόρατος τῇ θειότητι αὐτοῦ), being present with every human being and coextensive with the whole universe in its every part." Also note the saying in the Oxyrhynchian Logia "I stood *in the midst* of the world."

[3] *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. XIV, p. 315.

'foundation'." The conclusion is thus put: "How then does it come into the Odes? Obviously as a Syriac translation of *πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* by one who was familiar with the usual Peshitta version of this phrase."

This seemed to me, at the first reading, irresistible. And it still seems to me stronger than any of Dom Connolly's other instances. But in view of the fact that those other instances (in my opinion) point to a Hebrew rather than to a Greek original, and that they include no other alleged instance of allusion to the Peshitta, I was led to examine the subject more thoroughly, and to ask whether we could find any passage in Scripture that represents or suggests a picture of the Creator as preparing for the foundation of the world by some kind of "casting-down." If we could, it appeared to me that we should be justified in concluding that this alleged single instance affords no proof of a Greek original, or of a translation taken from the Peshitta.

A fallacy seems to me to lie in the assumption that a Christian writer in Hebrew at the end of the first century could not be aware of the Christian use of a remarkable phrase like *καταβολὴ κόσμου*, which, as we shall see, was variously interpreted in early times. The Greek might be rendered literally, "casting-down"—in connection with God's "*casting-down*," or "*laying-down*," of the ground-plan of Creation or "the aeon." That is what *καταβολή* means here. But *καταβολή* may mean "casting-down" in the sense of "destruction," and it is so rendered, in the only instance in which Justin Martyr uses it, in T. & T. Clark's translation ("destruction of the Tower"). There was therefore a temptation to paraphrase it. Latin translators called it *constitutio*. Early Syriac translators paraphrased it in various ways, and conformed the phrase to the thought of Biblical Hebrew. But the Greek phrase might be taken in a poetic and allusive sense, and our Poet (I contend) took it thus, and used it literally, poetically, and allusively. Some centuries afterwards

the translators of the Peshitta took it literally, and (probably) not poetically. That is to say, they resorted to this Syriac word merely as a safe and literal translation of a term that they knew to be variously interpreted (as it was for example by Origen and others). Perhaps they regarded it as meaning "established" or "founded." But our Poet apparently does not. This appears from the fact that, when he means "established" or "founded," he uses other words[1].

The following facts shew that the phrase probably attracted attention in early times:

(1) There is no passage in the Gospels where two Evangelists agree in assigning this phrase to Jesus.

(2) Where Matthew quotes it as part of a Psalm, Matthew has "*from the casting-down*," and some readings of Matthew have "*from the casting-down of the world* (cosmos)"; but the Psalm, in the Hebrew, has "*from beforetime*," and, in the Greek, "*from the beginning*[2]."

(3) Where Luke speaks of blood "*shed from the casting-down of the cosmos*," Matthew has "*shed upon the earth*," which suggests that an original "*from the casting-down*" was misunderstood by Matthew as meaning "from the casting-down [on the earth] of Abel's blood" and expanded by Luke by adding "of the cosmos" so as to make the meaning clear[3].

---

[1] Odes xxii. 12 (Harnack) "Grundlage," xxxv. 5 "Fundament," xxxviii. 17 "Fundament," use a word (*Thes.* 4348) that has no connection with the word we are considering, viz. "casting-down." Our word is used also of (*Thes.* 3928) "casting" or "depositing" seed in the earth (and also in Heb. xi. 11 VHh).

[2] Mt. xiii. 35, quoting Ps. lxxviii. 2. Why did Matthew use this paraphrase? Perhaps because, in view of various renderings of the Hebrew, he wished to express the thought of what Jerome calls, not "fundamentum" but "initium fundamenti." Horace might think of it as the rubble, so to speak, cast into the depth of the waters, to prepare a basis for a foundation (comp. Hor. *Carm.* iii. 1. 34—5 "jactis in altum molibus, huc frequens caementa demittit redemptor").

[3] Lk. xi. 50; Mt. xxiii. 35 ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Matthew would no doubt be influenced by the repeated mention of γῆ in Gen. iv. 10—12.

(4) The Hebrew *kedem* which means "*beforetime*" is rendered in LXX once "*before the aeons*"; and, when "from" is added, "from beforetime" is once rendered "*before* [*the*] *aeon* (*sing.*)[1]."

(5) Epictetus bids us regard man as our brother, "who has Zeus for his ancestor, and is, as it were, son from the same *seed* and from the same *casting-down* from above[2]." There is a similar connection certainly in the Epistle to the Hebrews (καταβολὴ σπέρματος), and perhaps in Clement of Rome[3].

(6) Origen and Chrysostom take καταβολή as "*casting-down*[4]." Jerome[5] explains it from the phrase "cast (jaciunt) foundations," and points out that *the Latin "constitutio" does not exactly express the meaning*, which is (he says) not "fundamentum," but "initium fundamenti." This is a very different thing from "constitutio."

(7) Before the first century καταβολή seems to have been used to mean the "putting down" of ready money, the "casting" of seed, the "descent" of fever, disease &c., but not "foundation," except (1) in the phrase "from the bottom," i.e. *de novo*, (2) in special contexts implying foundation[6]. The Thesaurus gives no instance (apart from N.T.) of "before *the casting-down*," in the sense of "before the *foundation* of the world."

(8) An earlier Ode connects God's "design" of Re-

[1] Ps. lv. 19, Ps. lxxiv. 12.

[2] Epict. i. 13. 3, where the Latin has "Coelesti *satu* editus."

[3] Heb. xi. 11, Clem. § 57 οἱ τὴν καταβολὴν (but Lightf. *foundation*) τῆς στάσεως ποιήσαντες (the only instance in the Apostolic Fathers (exc. Barn. v. 5 quoting Gen. i. 26 as uttered by God to "the Lord" "from *the casting-down* of the world")). In Justin Martyr *Tryph.* § 102 ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τοῦ πύργου καταβολῇ, it prob. means God's "*descent*" (and not, as in T. & T. Clark's translation, "destruction"). Comp. Gen. xi. 7 "let us go *down*."

[4] Origen on Jn xvii. 24, and Chrys. on Eph. i. 4. They are thereby led into strange interpretations.

[5] Jerome on Eph. i. 4.

[6] See Steph. *Thes.* quoting (1) phrases with ἐκ and (2) Polyb. xiii. 6. 2, καταβολὴν ἐποιεῖτο καὶ θεμέλιον ὑπεβάλλετο πολυχρονίου τυραννίδος.

demption with "casting-down" under the term "shooting." It is described as being like an arrow that is "*shot*," and also as "like a letter"; and this letter, which has a divine "seal" upon it, is "a great tablet" "wholly written by the finger of God[1]." This "seal" is apparently "Truth[2]," and the vision is connected with the revelation of "the Son of Truth from the Father, the Most High," who "inherited and took possession of everything."

(9) Of the two scriptural passages that describe in poetic detail the creation of the world, one, in Job, expressly mentions God as "*casting-down* (or *throwing*, or *shooting*) the corner-stone," just before He "shut up the sea with doors[3]." The other, in Proverbs, mentions "the sea" first, and says "When he gave to the sea its bound...when he marked out the foundations of the earth[4]." The former passage suggests the thought of God as "casting down" into the waters a living and growing Stone, the Stone of Truth and Order, which might be regarded by a poet as an "earnest" or "instalment (*καταβολή*)" of the ultimately developed Cosmos, or Harmony of the universe.

(10) According to a tradition in *Joma*, "The Holy One, blessed be He, *threw a stone* into the sea, and from this the world was *founded*[5]." Such a tradition accords with the

[1] Ode xxiii., see *Light on the Gospel* 3887—91.

[2] See *Light on the Gospel* 3891 *b* quoting Bab. Talm. on a "paper" or "tablet" *falling from heaven*, with "Truth" inscribed on it, whence the inference is drawn "Truth is God's seal."

[3] Job xxxviii. 6 R.V. "*laid*," but Heb. "*shot*" or "*threw*." The Hebrew for "*shoot*" in Job is rendered in Targ. and Syr. by the word used in Ode xxiii. 5 "violently-shot." The Hebrew has, as derivatives (Gesen. 435 foll.) the well-known *Tôrah*, "teaching" or "law," as well as fertilising "rain"—so that its associations are far more exalted than we might suppose. Jerome *ad loc.* interprets the "corner-stone" as the Son and the "*shooting*" as referring to the Incarnation.

[4] Prov. viii. 29.

[5] *Joma* 54 *b*, quoting Job xxxviii. 6. The thought of God the Redeemer "casting down" the substratum for a foundation is quaintly illustrated by

thought of Job, and of the Odes, especially if we add, from the Ode about the Arrow, the sign of a "seal," and, from the Talmud, that "Truth is God's seal," and, from the Ode again, "He was known from before the *casting-down of the aeon* that He might save souls for ever by *the truth of His name*[1]."

(11) It may be worth adding that the Greek word καταβολή occurs abundantly in New Hebrew. Its meaning is said to be generally, "mattress," or "covering on which something rests." No instance is alleged (so far as I know) of a metaphorical use[2]. But it may have influenced the use of the term in the earliest Christian literature.

(12) "*The foundation of the world*"—that is to say, the Greek phrase thus rendered in our Authorised Version of Matthew—is rendered very variously in various English Versions of the Gospels. And the variations have a direct bearing on our investigation. For they indicate a danger in such a conclusion as we are now considering, which is, in effect, "*Since the Poet here uses a phrase that occurs in the later Syriac version of N.T., and not in the earlier Syriac versions, meaning 'the foundation of the world,' it follows that he wrote after that later Syriac version.*"

In Mt. xiii. 35, for example, we might infer, that an English author quoting "*from the foundation of the world*" (as A.V. A.D. 1611) and not "from the begynning(e) of the world(e)" (as Tyndale, Cranmer, and Geneva, A.D. 1534—57) wrote after A.D. 1611. But he might be quoting from the Rheims Version (A.D. 1582).

Again, in Mt. xxv. 34, if we inferred from a mention of "*foundations*" that he was quoting, with a slight variation, the

the above-quoted Horatian "caementa demittit redemptor," *i.e.* the contractor.

[1] It must be admitted, however, that the "*shooting*" of the "stone" or the "arrow" is not the same word as the "*casting-down*" in the Ode.

[2] See Levy iv. 279 *a*. Krauss (pp. 523 and 566) gives more than a dozen instances. He adds (p. 524) one instance of Heb. καταβλητόν as meaning "payment of a fine."

Rheims Version (A.D. 1582), we should be wrong again, for "*foundations*" in the plural occurs in the Geneva Version (A.D. 1557).

Lastly, if we inferred from an author quoting Luke xi. 50, "*from the making of the world*" (as in the Rheims Version) that he wrote after 1582, we should be once more wrong. For he might be quoting from Wiclif (A.D. 1380)[1].

In view of these facts it appears to me quite reasonable, as well as charitable to our Poet, to suppose that when he spoke of "*the casting-down of the aeon*," he did not mean what he speaks of elsewhere as "*foundation*," "*founding*," or "*establishing*." The conclusion that the expression is to be taken "obviously as a Syriac translation of πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου by one who was familiar with the usual Peshitta version of this phrase" is also open to this objection, that not one more instance of such "translation" is even alleged in the very able paper to which this Chapter calls attention. The other nine alleged instances of Greek influence appear to me to point either to Hebrew, or at all events not to Greek. And though this, the tenth, points to Greek, it is perfectly compatible with the belief that our Poet wrote in Hebrew. Writing in Hebrew did not preclude him from borrowing thoughts from the Greek of the Gospels any more than from the Greek of Philo[2].

[1] Compare also Jn xvii. 24, where "before the making of the world" is not only in Wiclif (using "making," as he always does in the Gospels) but also in Tyndale and Cranmer. The facts in (12) are taken from *The English Hexapla*, London, 1841.

[2] See *Light on the Gospel* (Index "Philo"). It may be added that a poet writing in Hebrew, but versed in Greek, might be influenced in word, as well as in thought, by the flexibilities of the Greek language, so as to strain Hebrew to the utmost in order to express them, *e.g.* in the matter of emphasis and emphatic possessives discussed above in § 8.

§ 11. "*The babe leaping*"

After writing as above, I received from Dom Connolly, in the course of an interesting correspondence, the following observation, which he has authorised me to quote: "I wish some one would deal with the N.T. echoes in the Odes. There seem to me to be a number. Perhaps the most striking is that in Ode xxviii. 3 'as a babe that exults in the womb of its mother' (see the Syriac versions of Lk. i. 40)." This alleged "echo" well deserves investigation. I also believe that it is an "echo"—but not an "echo" of anything that is peculiar to the New Testament.

Let us first do justice to the similarity. It is enhanced by the contexts. Luke says "When Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe *leaped in her womb*; and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and she lifted up her voice with a loud cry and said "Blessed art thou...[1]." The Ode in question says "As the wings of the doves over their nestlings, and the mouth of their nestlings toward their mouths, so also are the wings of the Spirit over my heart. My heart is delighted and *leaps* [for joy], like the babe that *leaps in the womb* of his mother[2]."

I admit that this is very "striking." The obvious inference —obvious at all events to those who assume a Greek original for the Odes—is that the Odist wrote in Greek, and copied from Luke, who says that John the Baptist, as an unborn babe, "*leapt in the womb*" at the approach of the Redeemer who was in the womb of Mary.

But—what about the source of Luke's narrative itself? Grant that it is historical, and that every word of it is exactly true. Still, we may fairly say, "If this experience of Elisabeth is found to be in accordance with something in Jewish traditions about other mothers of Israel, we ought first of all to

[1] Lk. i. 41—2.

[2] Ode xxviii. 1—3.

examine those traditions. We are all the more bound to do this because the Greek phrase '*leap in the womb*' occurs nowhere in the Bible except as an obvious misrendering of '*push-against-one-another* in the womb,' applied to Jacob and Esau[1]. If this 'leaping' or 'exulting'—which really implies an 'exulting' to the glory of God—can be found in fairly early Jewish tradition, applied to unborn babes, glorifying the Lord their Redeemer in return for a special act of His redeeming power, then we ought not to commit ourselves to Luke, or at all events to Luke alone, as the source of our Poet's utterance."

Now we do find language of this kind in very early and widespread Jewish tradition. It is extant in (*inter alia*) the commentary of *Mechiltha* on the Redemption of Israel at the Red Sea. *Mechiltha* was mentioned above (§ 4) to shew that the very next words in the Ode to those we are now considering ("I believed, therefore I was at rest") probably implied an allusion to the connection between "rest," "stability," and "belief." According to *Mechiltha* it was as a reward of "belief" that "the Holy Spirit rested on Israel and they sang unto the Lord." Now we can go still further in the illustration of our Ode with the aid of *Mechiltha*, applying it to the "exultation" or "leaping" of the unborn child. For *Mechiltha*, on Exod. xv. 1 (Wü. p. 116) "I will sing unto Jehovah," quotes Rabbi Meir (whom Schürer places among the Rabbis of "the Third Generation," about 130—60 A.D.) thus:—

[1] Gen. xxv. 22. The LXX has mistaken רצץ, "crush," for a reduplicated form of דוץ (found as a v.r. in Levy *Ch.* i. 165 *b*). The Heb. דוץ occurs only in Job xli. 22 (14) where the LXX has mistaken it for רוץ, and consequently rendered it "run," instead of "dance." On Gen. xxv. 22, Rashi says "Rabbini nostri exponunt...ut significet ריצה i.e. *cursum*," because whenever Rebecca passed by a Schoolhouse of Shem, Jacob "ran" (i.e. "*currebat*...ut egrederetur"), and Esau did the same when she passed a place of idol-worship. But the Talmuds and Midrashim are not alleged for this view. *Tehillim* (Wü. i. 327) adopts the usual interpretation "crushed," which Rashi gives as an alternative.

"R. Meir says, *Even the babes unborn* (die Embryonen), which were in the wombs of their mothers, *opened their mouths and uttered the song* before God." This is not the eccentric and unsupported suggestion of a single Rabbi. It is repeated in both the Talmuds, and Rashi assumes it[1].

It may be urged that "opened their mouths and uttered the song" is not the same thing as "*exulted*" or "*leapt.*" But we find the Targum on the Psalms using this word "*leap*" as a rendering of the Hebrew for "psallere[2]," and it was a very natural way of paraphrasing a word that might raise objection, if taken literally. Indeed, objection is actually raised and answered in the Babylonian *Sota* ("How could the babe see?")[3]. It is worth noting how Origen combines the "*leaping*" of the unborn babe in Luke with an utterance of praise by his mother: "The voice of the salutation of Mary coming-to-pass in the ears of Elisabeth filled John with itself. Therefore John '*leaps*,' and his mother *becomes as it were her son's mouth, and also a prophetess...*[4]."

I cannot recall anything in Greek profane literature that would induce an early Christian poet writing in Greek to liken his soul to "a babe leaping in his mother's womb," because it "exults" in the motherly love of the Holy Spirit. The poetic tradition attributed to Rabbi Meir about the mothers of Israel at the Passage of the Red Sea sounds genuinely Jewish. It is difficult—I should call it impossible—to believe that R. Meir borrowed "the exultant song of the unborn babes" from Luke; but it is quite intelligible as part of a whole series of what would in English be called ballads, but would be better called, among the Jews, school-poetry—unwritten poetic amplifications of the poetry of the Old Testament, current in the first century and

[1] See *b. Sota* 31 *a*, *j. Sota* v. 4 (Schwab vii. 287), *Berach.* 50 *a*, and Rashi on Ps. lxviii. 26 (as also *Tehillim* ad loc.).

[2] Ps. xxi. 13.

[3] Also see Wagenseil on *Sota*, pp. 617—9.

[4] Origen, *Comm. Joann.* vi. 30 (Lomm. i. 254).

later concerning that notable Deliverance which was stamped on the Jewish mind by the institution of the Passover. There are other passages in this Ode, that seem to allude to the Exodus or the Wandering in the Wilderness, such as "I have been set on his incorruptible pinions[1]" and "I was persecuted and they supposed that I was swallowed up, for I seemed to them as one of the lost[2]." Others shew us how a Jewish Poet might merge the thought of Israel in the thought of Moses or the Messiah, just as Matthew applies to Jesus part of the saying of Hosea concerning Israel, "Out of Egypt have I called my son....I taught Ephraim to walk," "he took them in his arms[3]." Into these we cannot enter[4], but they combine to convince us that we have in the composer of the Odes a man saturated with Jewish tradition, Christianized but not Hellenized, and much more likely to borrow the phrase we are discussing from prevalent first-century Jewish tradition, represented for us in the second century by Rabbi Meir, than from a single Greek instance in Luke of an apparently non-Greek phrase[5].

---

[1] Ode xxviii. 6. Comp. Exod. xix. 4 "I bare you on eagles' wings."

[2] Ode xxviii. 8. Comp. Exod. xiv. 3, xv. 9 "they are entangled...," "my hand shall destroy them."

[3] Hos. xi. 1—3, Mt. ii. 15.

[4] One of them is Ode xxviii. 13 "But I was carrying water in my right hand, and their bitterness I endured by my sweetness." This looks like a Christian view of the much discussed "*tree*," which God (Exod. xv. 25) "*taught*" Moses—not "*shewed*" but "*taught*," says *Mechiltha*, in effect, *ad loc.* Wü. "lehrte ihn"—near the waters of Marah. See *Indices to Diatessarica* p. xxxv. foll. on the various Jewish and Christian traditions as to this "*tree*"—which Origen interprets as the Cross.

[5] By "apparently non-Greek," I mean that the Thesaurus, under σκιρτάω, not only gives no other instance of ἐσκίρτησε βρέφος except Lk. i. 44, but also gives another word (ἀσκαρίζω) as the word used by Hippocrates in this sense. As for σκιρτάω, it has been shewn above that, as applied by the LXX to Jacob and Esau, it had a meaning alien from Luke's purpose.

I have only space for a few words on another similarity, to which Dom Connolly called my attention—between Ode viii. 3 "to bring fruits to the Lord, living, holy," and Rom. xii. 1 "to present your bodies, a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God." He added that "*bring*," not "*bring forth*," was the meaning of the Syriac.

If we could be certain that the Syr. "*bring*" (the causative of *ĕtha*, familiar to us in *Maran-atha*) did not mean "*bring forth*," but "*bring as an offering*," I should then suggest that the Poet had in view a contrast between (Gen. iv. 3—5) the first two sacrifices—the "*bringing*" *of* "*the fruit of the ground*" (by Cain) and the "*bringing*" of living animals (by Abel). The Syriac "bring" is the same there as here. Cain's act is traditionally regarded as what one might call "a dead work"; Abel's, as an act of faith by which—as Philo (i. 200) says—"though dead he still *lives*." The hypothesis of an allusion to Genesis would enable us to paraphrase the passage in the Ode with its preceding context thus: "Let your worship spring from your heart and from the leaping up of love from the heart to the lips, so as to bring unto the Lord an offering, not of selfish and dead works (like Cain's) but one that is holy and lives for ever (like Abel's)."

But the Thesaurus 416—7 gives many instances where Syriac Versions use the causative of *ĕtha* with "fruit," to mean "*bring forth*." Among these are (in Pesh., Palest., and SS) Jn xv. 8, 16, where the "bringing forth" of "fruit" by the disciples is described as tending to the "glorifying" of "the Father," and Jesus says (SS and Pesh.) "I have chosen you and set you that ye should be going [on] *bringing forth fruit*, and *your fruit should remain*[1]." "Remain" implies that their "fruit" will be "living." Also it must needs be "holy," for they (Jn xv. 4—6) "*remain*" in "the Vine"; and the Vine is (*Didach.* ix. 2) "the *Holy Vine* of David," the Vine of the Spiritual Israel.

[1] Jn xv. 16. The Palest. Syr. does not include this verse.

There is no reason, however, why a true Israelite should not be regarded by a Jewish poet as a fruitful tree in two aspects. He not only "*brings forth*" fruit, but also "*brings*" fruit to the Lord *as an offering*. For these reasons, instead of saying that the Poet is echoing the Apostle, I should be disposed to say that both the Poet and the Apostle are going back in thought to Abel's sacrifice, with Cain's in the background. Cain was the type of those who tithed mint, anise, and cummin. Abel was the type of those whose hearts cried out—and whose hands expressed—(Ps. xl. 8) "I delight to do thy will, O my God." Concerning this heartfelt sacrifice of penitence and praise Isaiah represents God as saying "I create the fruit of the lips," and Hosea represents penitent Israel as saying "we will duly-offer *bullocks*, [*namely*] *our lips*" —thoughts echoed in the Epistle to the Hebrews (which speaks of "the fruit of lips that make confession" to God's name) and also in the present Ode[1].

§ 12. *Postscript on the Anaphora of St James*

Dom Connolly's inference from what appeared to him the indiscriminate use of the Syriac detachable possessive in the Odes led me to investigate the matter, in the following circumstances, after most of the preceding paragraphs were in type. In a letter, full of suggestive observations—which I would most gladly discuss did space allow—he asked me to look at some proof sheets of the Syriac Liturgy (Anaphora) of "St James," which he was kind enough to enclose for my inspection. In these, he had underlined passages where the detachable possessive occurs. He pointed out how, in this Syriac, "translated from the Greek (mostly extant) probably in the second half of the 5th century," this detachable possessive "came to be employed almost to the exclusion of possessive

[1] Is. lvii. 19 "fruit," Theod. *καρπόν*, but not the usual Heb. for "fruit"; Hos. xiv. 2 (on which see Jerome and *Joma* 86 *b*), Heb. xiii. 15.

suffixes," illustrating his remark by a comparison of such a translation with the Peshitta version of the Psalms where the detachable possessive could hardly be found. He added that even the Peshitta version of the Gospels would shew nothing to parallel the use of the possessive in the document he enclosed, so that the facts confirmed his conclusion that "the Syr. text of the Odes is a relatively late one."

These remarks appeared to me to deserve the most careful consideration, and I have endeavoured to do justice to them. They may lead my readers, as they have led me, to a quite new appreciation of the variations of Christian hymnology in the earliest times, if they will have the patience to go back as far as possible to the original authorities, and the courage to face detailed fact. For of course the first step was to go back to the Greek of the Anaphora. If the Greek contained nothing but unemphatic possessive expressions where the Syriac contained the detachable possessive, then Dom Connolly had proved his point. I therefore turned to Swainson's *The Greek Liturgies*, where the Greek of the Anaphora is printed in four parallel columns, and compared the Greek with the Syriac[1].

I found that the instances underlined by Dom Connolly began a little before the words "This is my body" and were very numerous indeed. Moreover, as to the sacred formula itself, Dom Connolly pointed out that, whereas the Peshitta uses the unemphatic suffix "*my-body*," the Syriac Anaphora has "*the body that-is-mine*" (as also "*the blood that-is-mine*"). Here, however, we have to note that the Greek does not follow the tradition of the Three Synoptists τὸ σῶμά μου, but that of Paul, τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα[2]. Now although the possessive *μου, when placed before its noun and the article, ought to be unemphatic* and to throw the emphasis on the noun, yet

[1] *The Greek Liturgies*, by C. A. Swainson, D.D. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1884), to be hereafter referred to as *Liturg.*

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 24 adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. Anaph. adds τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον καὶ διαδιδόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

there appeared reasons for thinking that the author of the Anaphora—or at all events the writers of some texts of it—might regard it as *emphatic*[1].

One reason was this, that all through the Anaphora, where there is an antithesis (as there often is) between the goodness and kindness of God and the imperfections and necessities of Man, the Greek writer rarely, if ever, uses the unemphatic expression to signify "His" or "Thy." Even where there was no such antithesis, I have failed (so far) to find *the unemphatic form, in Greek, to signify divine possession.* In the Pauline tradition there was a reason for the unemphatic "my" applied to "body," because Paul meant to emphasize "[body] *that is for you,*" reserving the personal emphasis for "*my own* commemoration" and "*my own* blood" in the following context[2]. But the Greek writer of the Anaphora, who blends

[1] See *Johannine Grammar* **2776—84** on "The Possessive Genitive." When the genitive pronoun comes *between* the article and its noun, it is emphatically reverential, *Liturg.* p. 260 τῶν ἀχράντων σου μυστηρίων, *ib.* τὸ ἅγιόν σου...θυσιαστήριον. But see below for variations in the texts indicating that the Greek possessive, even when preceding the article, may have been regarded by the scribes of the Anaphora as emphatic.

In Dom Connolly's Syriac text of the Anaphora, the order of the words is "This *that-which-is-mine* is the body," representing exactly the order of the Pauline formula, Τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα. I am informed by Rev. G. Margoliouth that this is the order of the Syriac in the Liturgy of St John the Evangelist (*e.g.* Brit. Mus. MSS Or. 2293 and 2295), but that in the Anaphora of St James the Brother of the Lord, the reading in the MSS referred to is "This [is] my-body that-is-for-you," and that, in the printed texts (Rome, 1592 and 1843) a unified form of the words has been employed, the reading in every Anaphora being: "This is the-body [*the body*] *that-is-mine*" (apparently influenced by the Harklensian version, in which the Syriac "*that-which-is-mine*" comes last)—not only in the Gospels, where μου comes last, but also in the Epistle to the Corinthians, where μου does not come last.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 24—5 may be paraphrased as meaning "This is the body that-I-give-you (τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα) which [is offered] in your behalf (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν): do this with-a-view-to (εἰς) the commemoration of me (emph.) (τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν)....This cup is the new testament (*or*, covenant) in my-own (emph.) blood (ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι)."

the Pauline with the Synoptic tradition, has not "*my own* (*τὸ ἐμὸν*) blood," but *τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ αἷμα*[1]. It is not improbable that the Greek writer in both cases regarded the *μου* as emphatic. It is at all events highly probable, if not certain, that the Syriac translator would regard it as emphatic, and would represent it by the Syriac detachable possessive which represents our reverential "Thy," "His," and (in modern hymnology) "My."

There is all the more excuse for the Syriac translator (if he is wrong) because, even as regards the sacred formula, the different MSS of the same Liturgy sometimes vary. For example, in the Liturgy of Alexandria, one Codex has *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου* (with the Synoptists), but two others *τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα* (with Paul)[2]. A Liturgy of Saint Basil also has the Synoptic form[3]. Both these Liturgies, in all the MSS, add some version of the clause *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, which is not in the Synoptists. Both also have the same possessive form, in their various MSS, for "the body" and "the blood." But the Liturgy of Saint Chrysostom has the Pauline form for "the body" and the Synoptic form for "the blood[4]."

The unemphatic Greek possessive in the Anaphora occurs in such expressions as "Purify my lips and heart" and "Sanctify our souls and bodies and spirits[5]"; but a cursory glance at several pages of Swainson's edition has revealed no other instances. For the most part, even when the Greek writer is using "our" or "my" about men, he uses the emphatic form where there is contrast (as there often is)

[1] *Liturg.* pp. 274—5.

[2] *Liturg.* pp. 52—3. They also vary as to *αἷμα* similarly.

[3] *Liturg.* p. 82.

[4] *Liturg.* p. 129. So also has a "Liturgy of Saint Basil" on p. 160.

[5] *Liturg.* pp. 256, 262. That is because there is an emphasis on the nouns as distinct from the possessive. In the former sentence, *ἐξάλειψόν μου τὰ παραπτώματα* is the reading of two MSS, but a third omits *μου* and a fourth has it at the end of the clause.

between Man and God, or else the neutral form[1]. In Eucharistic Liturgies there must needs be a pervasive emphasis of pronouns in contrasts between God's kindness and helpfulness and Man's unworthiness and helplessness[2].

It is quite true that in the Syriac Version of the Old Testament the detachable Syriac possessive is extremely rare. But there is good reason for the rarity. The Hebrew Scripture, even where it emphasizes the contrast between what is God's and what is Man's, does not use *shel*, which might have enabled the Psalmist to express emphasis. The Biblical Hebrew, therefore, leaves it unexpressed. The LXX follows the Hebrew. The Syriac follows the Hebrew or the LXX. The result is that in the Old Testament and its most ancient versions the contrast of thought is left unexpressed by grammatical inflexion.

But when the first century brought into Jewish literature the thoughts that gathered round the belief in the Incarnation, then the contrast between the love and kindness that came down from God to Man, and the helplessness and sinfulness that went up in appeal from Man to God, would require altogether new forms of expression. And these would naturally spring into greatest prominence in Christian Liturgies. We have above noted one phase of this development,

[1] *Liturg.* pp. 262 and 265 τὰς νοερὰς ἡμῶν ὄψεις τοῦ ἀπεριλήπτου φωτὸς πλήρωσον may at first sight be regarded as emphatic without contrast. But that contrast is *implied* may be seen by comparing p. 264, where the same expression occurs, only with σου inserted before φωτὸς ἀποπλήρωσον. There is a contrast in all the passages—expressed or implied—between "our" and "Thy."

[2] Comp. *Liturg.* p. 256, "Reject not *my* (τὴν ἐμὴν) unworthiness... according to *thy* great mercy (τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου, Paris MS 476 τὸ μέγα σου ἔλεος)," *ib.* p. 258 "Not in *our* righteousness (ταῖς δικαιοσύναις ἡμῶν) do we trust but in *thy* good mercy (ἐπὶ τῷ ἐλέει σου τῷ ἀγαθῷ)," *ib.* p. 264 "having deemed me, *thy* sinful servant, worthy to stand at *thy* holy altar," where Rot. Mess. has τὸν...σου δοῦλον, but Paris MS 476 τὸν...δοῦλόν σου, *ib.* p. 276 "Requite us not according to *our* iniquities (τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν) but according to *thy* kindness (κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐπιείκειαν)."

when comparing the brief and original form—neither emphatically personal nor yet unemphatic—of the sacramental words of Institution, as recorded by the Synoptists, with the newer and amplified form given in the Pauline tradition. The latter, we found, emphasizes, first, the sacrificial nature of the gift of "the body," and then the personal nature of the "commemoration." The Greek Anaphora carries further this development. We may take, as a verbal test of Eucharistic emphasis—as a kind of Eucharistometer—the use of the emphatic personal "Thy" (σός) applied to the Lord. It occurs less than a dozen times in the LXX version of the Psalms[1]. But it occurs twice or thrice in the first few lines of most MSS of the Anaphora[2]. This confirms the conclusion that, in the Anaphora, the Syriac emphatic rendering springs, not from an indiscriminate use of the detachable possessive, but from a desire to render literally the original Eucharistic thought.

With such thought—the thought of Eucharistic contrast—the Odes of Solomon are from first to last imbued. We are therefore safe in saying that in a very great number of cases the Syriac detachable suffix is no more indiscriminate in the Odes than in the Anaphora. But can we go further and conclude that the Syriac Translator of the Odes, when using these possessives, may be literally translating from Hebrew? On that point more evidence is necessary, not only as to the usage of what is generally called Mishnic Hebrew[3], but also

[1] This includes all uses in the Psalms.

[2] *Liturg.* pp. 256—7. The texts vary slightly. (One MS has πολλὴν for σήν.) It occurs also once or twice on pp. 258—9 (where again the texts vary), thrice on pp. 270—1 &c. In the Apostolic Fathers—apart from Hermas (who uses it in precepts about "one's own wife" &c.)—σός occurs (as an adjective with noun) only in Clem. Rom. § 60 τῆς σῆς ἀληθείας (a quasi-Eucharistic prayer), and *Didach.* ix. 4, x. 5 (rep.) εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν (in the actual Eucharist).

[3] We have to bear in mind that, even after the exile, Biblical Psalms —and some of the most beautiful of them—were still composed in

as to the kind of Hebrew that would be written in the first century by a Jewish poet writing in the name of Solomon, and in a tone very different indeed from that of the extant Psalms of Solomon, and resembling in some respects the tone of Solomon's Song in the Bible.

If we were to trust merely to the evidence of the Prayers of ancient post-Christian Rabbis recorded in the Talmud, it would appear that even in contrasts between God's kindness and Man's need, the Rabbis contented themselves with the ordinary Hebrew suffix without using the detachable particle[1].

But in the Jewish Thanksgiving after Meals—which (I am informed) is of very great antiquity—the divine "His" is expressed by a form of *shel* thus: "we have eaten of *that-which-is-His*[2]." And Levy quotes, from the Jerusalem as

Hebrew, not in Aramaic. What is called "Mishnic Hebrew" was not invented by those who uttered the earliest of the sayings known to us as Mishna. It was merely one form of literary Hebrew—namely, that form which had come into use, by the second century, among Rabbis teaching in the schools. Even in the Talmuds there are great differences of style. The prose of legal discussion may be found intermixed with the poetry of a soaring imagination or extravagant fancy. The Hebrew of the Odes of Solomon (if they were composed in Hebrew) may have been as different from the Hebrew of the more prosaic parts of the Mishna as the English of Marlowe from the English of Bishop Burnet.

[1] See the Prayers in *Berach.* 16 *b* foll. They contain (as far as I have seen) no instance of a reverential "Thy" &c. represented by anything more than the possessive suffix. Several of them begin with "May there be *a will* (or, *good-pleasure*) *from-before-thy-face*" (Goldschmidt and Schwab "*thy will*"). In the prayer of "Rabh" for "a life *of* peace, a life *of* good, a life *of* blessing...," "of" is represented in each case by *shel.*

[2] *Jewish Prayer Book*, ed. Singer, p. 279 "Blessed be (our God) he of whose bounty we have partaken," but *lit.* "Blessed be He [as to] whom (ש) we have eaten *from-that-which-is-His* (משלו)." The form in the Mishna of *Berach.* vii. 3, repeating the grace several times—with variations adapted to the numbers present—does not contain the italicised words, except partially at the last two repetitions, where it has "for that which we have eaten."

On the use of *shel* with suffix as a possessive pronoun, a few remarks

well as from the Babylonian Talmud, words ascribed to God as follows "Slay [the sacrifices, or beasts] *that-are-mine* in *that-which-is-mine* [i.e. in my Temple] and *that-which-is-thine*

may be found in Albrecht's *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, 1913 (pp. 56—7), but the subject is much more fully treated in an Article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1908, Vol. xx, No. 80, pp. 647—737 on Mishnaic Hebrew, by the Rev. Moses H. Segal. He gives abundant instances of Hebrew "circumlocution of the genitive," with and without "anticipation," and speaks (p. 724) of the use of *shel* as very ancient. Of Mishnaic "circumlocution with anticipation" he says (p. 728) "generally the construction has an emphatic force"; but (p. 731) "gradually the idiom began to be used more frequently, and then regularly whenever any stress was to be laid upon a noun, and, in the course of time, even where no emphasis was intended."

"In about forty passages in the Mishna," he adds (p. 732), "and frequently in the Midrashim, circumlocution by שֶׁל with the appropriate suffix is found in the place of the possessive suffix attached immediately to the noun itself. This construction is used (*a*) on grounds of grammar, where, namely, the noun cannot take the suffix through being indeclinable or consisting of a compound expression, and (*b*) on grounds of style, where it is desirable to leave the noun unchanged for the sake of lucidity or emphasis."

Almost all Mr Segal's instances are taken from the Mishna, where we cannot expect poetic expression. The impression left by his laborious research is that if it had extended to the poetic and mystical portions of the Midrashim, it might have given us instances like that in *Sabbath* 104 *a* (Goldschmidt) "He, Vay, das ist der Name des Heiligen...," where the literal Hebrew has "He, Vaw, this is His name [*the name*] *that* [*belongs*] *to* (*shel*) the Holy One...." In *Gen. r.* (on Gen. xxviii. 11, as quoted in Levy iii. 219 *b*)—where reasons are given for calling God PLACE—*shel* is used with "the Holy One," and with "His world": "Why do they form [as they do] His Name [the Name] *that* [*appertains*] *to* the Holy One and call Him PLACE? Because He is its-place [the place] *that* [*appertains*] *to* His world." That is, the world is included in Him; He, though in His world, is not included in it. But *shel* is not used with "Him" in what follows: "We should not know whether the Holy One [is the] place of His world, or whether His world [is] His place; but, from that which is written (Exod. xxxiii. 21) 'See, [there is] place with me,' it follows that the Holy One [is] its-place [the place] *that* [*appertains*] *to* [the] world, and not [that] His world [is] *His place.*" The antithesis, to be exact, would require at the close—instead of "*His place*"—"*His place* [*the place*] *that* [*appertains*] *to Him.*" But, either as being too lengthy, or for some other reason, it is avoided.

in *that-which-is-thine* [i.e. in thine own house][1]." We have seen above that *shel* occurs thrice in the short Song of Solomon which is written in Hebrew. Moreover in the Song of Jacob—instead of "until *Shiloh* come"—most ancient authorities agree in reading some form of *shel*, meaning "*that* [*kingdom*] *which* [*is reserved*] *for Him*," or "*He for whom* [*the kingdom &c. is reserved*][2]." Is it unreasonable that, in attempting to account for the very numerous emphatic pronominal contrasts in the Odes of Solomon, expressed by the Syriac relative, those who are taking a Hebrew original as their working hypothesis should say that an explanation may be first sought—at all events in some instances—in the Hebrew *shel*?

It must be admitted, however, that as to some phrases, hallowed by old Hebraic usage, it is difficult to believe that a poet writing in later Hebrew would resort to the form *shel*, as for example in the phrase "*Thy* right hand"—even when it was emphatically contrasted with the feebleness of "the right hand" of Man. But what follows? Grant that the Poet, in a phrase of contrast, wrote, in Hebrew, "thy right hand" with the simple Hebrew suffix. Would not a translator, whether into Greek or Syriac, feel that the emphasis on "thy," though manifest to Jews, required to be brought out distinctly in a translation for Gentiles? Some of them, being idolaters, might even think of "thy right hand" as being distinct from "thy left hand" or "thy foot" or some other member of their God. Even by the more intelligent the full

[1] Levy iv. 556 *b* quoting *j. Abod. sar.* V, 45 *b* and *Kidd.* 57 *b*. It is interesting to note that in the Prayer of Jesus—represented differently in Mark xiv. 36 *οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω...*, Mt. xxvi. 39 *οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω...*, Lk. xxii. 42 *μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου....*—SS has "Not *my will*, *that-which-*[*is*]*-mine*...but *that-which-*[*is*]*-thine*," in all three Gospels.

[2] Gen. xlix. 10, LXX and Theod. *τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ*. But *al. exempl.* *ᾧ ἀπόκειται*, as Onk. "the Messiah *whose is the kingdom*," and the Peshitta "*He whose it is.*"

force of the Hebrew suffix would probably not be felt. A Syriac translator, faithful even to baldness in other respects, might well deviate in this one respect from a Hebrew original, expressing faithfully with his pen what the writer of the Hebrew would expect his readers to express with their voice.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.
102922

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

PUBLISHED BY ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK, SOHO SQUARE, LONDON, W.

CLUE: A Guide through Greek to Hebrew Scripture (Diatessarica—Part I).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (*post free 7s. 10d.*)

THE CORRECTIONS OF MARK (Diatessarica—Part II).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 15s. net. (*post free 15s. 5d.*)

FROM LETTER TO SPIRIT (Diatessarica—Part III).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 20s. net. (*post free 20s. 5d.*)

PARADOSIS (Diatessarica—Part IV).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (*post free 7s. 10d.*)

JOHANNINE VOCABULARY (Diatessarica—Part V).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 13s. 6d. net. (*post free 13s. 10d.*)

JOHANNINE GRAMMAR (Diatessarica—Part VI).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (*post free 16s. 11d.*)

SILANUS THE CHRISTIAN.
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (*post free 7s. 10d.*)

APOLOGIA: An Explanation and Defence.
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (*post free 2s. 10d.*)

NOTES ON NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM (Diatessarica—Part VII).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 7s. 6d. net. (*post free 7s. 10d.*)

INDICES TO DIATESSARICA.
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (*post free 2s. 10d.*)

THE MESSAGE OF THE SON OF MAN
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 4s. 6d. net. (*post free 4s. 10d.*)

PUBLISHED BY THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE SON OF MAN (Diatessarica—Part VIII).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 16s. 6d. net. (*post free 17s.*)

LIGHT ON THE GOSPEL FROM AN ANCIENT POET (Diatessarica—Part IX).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 12s. 6d. net. (*post free 12s. 11d.*)

THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL, INTRODUCTION (Diatessarica—Part X, Section I).
Demy 8vo, Cloth, Price 2s. 6d. net. (*post free 2s. 10d.*)

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BS2555 .A32
Abbott, Edwin Abbott, 1838-1926.
Miscellanea evangelica, I.

102922

BS
2555
A32

Abbott, Edwin Abbott, 1838-1926.
Miscellanea evangelica, I. Cambridge [Eng.] University Press, 1913.
[viii], 97p. 22cm.

Appendices to sect.2 of the author's The fourfold Gospel.

1. Bible. N.T. Gospels--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Abbott, Edwin Abbott, 1838-1926. The fourfold Gospel. II. Title.

102922

CCSC/mmb